

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 928

JC 860 052

AUTHOR Heck, James
TITLE Community College Honors Program.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Feb 86
NOTE 103p.; Based on a dissertation completed at the University of Florida.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; *Honors Curriculum; *Institutional Evaluation; Models; *Program Development; *Program Implementation; Surveys; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine whether the strategies and tactics employed in the implementation and continuation of well-established honors programs at selected community colleges followed the five stages that Martorana and Kuhns identified as phases in the life cycle of academic innovation (i.e., exploration, formulation, trial, refinement, and institutionalization). Following informal surveys of chief administrators at 80 community colleges in Florida and other selected states, qualitative research methods were used in in-depth studies of the honors programs at three selected colleges (Daytona Beach Community College in Daytona Beach, Florida; DeKalb Community College, Atlanta, Georgia; and Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York). Study findings, included the following: (1) all three colleges employed strategies and tactics corresponding to the exploration, formulation, refinement, and institutionalization stages theorized by Martorana and Kuhns; (2) insufficient evidence existed to demonstrate that any of the three study sites experienced a trial stage; (3) all strategies and tactics used by the community colleges could easily be categorized within one of the five stages; (4) the developmental stages did not have absolute time-sequence boundaries; and (5) few respondents were able to articulate a comprehensive view of the establishment and continuation of honors programs. The study report includes a description of a model for the establishment and continuation of honors programs structured around the four stages employed by the community colleges involved in the study. (LAL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Wattenbarger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE HONORS PROGRAMS

BY

JAMES HECK

INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1985

ED264928

1C860052

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD.....	iv
CHAPTERS	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	5
Justification for the Study.....	6
Assumptions.....	7
Procedures.....	9
Summary of the Literature Review.....	14
II RESULTS.....	16
Exploration Stage.....	16
Formulation Stage.....	22
Trial Stage.....	26
Refinement Stage.....	29
Institutionalization Stage.....	32
Summary of Results.....	44
III DISCUSSION.....	46
IV RECOMMENDATIONS: A MODEL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND CONTINUATION OF HONORS PROGRAMS AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES.....	52
Exploration Stage.....	53
Formulation Stage.....	58
Refinement Stage.....	63
Institutionalization Stage.....	66
V SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	79
REFERENCES.....	83

APPENDIX

A.	Checklist Used as Interview Guide.....	86
B.	Major Features of a Full Honors Program.....	92
C.	Informal Survey Sent to Academic Officers.....	94
D.	List of Individuals Interviewed at Study Sites.....	96
E.	Specific Colleges Belonging to the League for Innovation in the Community College Listed as Having Honors Program.....	97

FOREWORD

Community colleges are egalitarian institutions. Their emphasis is upon making education more generally available to the greater number of people, many of whom would not have had opportunities for formal education beyond high school were there no community colleges. Barriers are lifted, new opportunities created, new potentials opened up.

For these reasons most community colleges have not up to now given any special consideration to the academically superior student. During the past few years, however, a number of colleges have examined ways to meet the needs of the broad range of students who attend and have concluded that honors programs are among the most viable alternatives. Establishing an honors program is not a mere automatic process but rather one that deserves special attention and careful planning. The Martorana/Kuhns Interactive Forces Theory would seem to provide a basis for procedures to be used in instituting a new honors program.

Dr. James Heck has demonstrated how this may be carried out through a process of testing the Martorana-Kuhns theory. The recommended steps work well.

If a college wishes to provide for this special group of students, Dr. Heck has outlined the information in this report to show how it may be done. The Institute of Higher Education is pleased to present this study for the examination of those who are interested. By following the steps outlined herein a program for Honors students will be available for those who can benefit and many of the possible mistakes may be avoided.

We are appreciative of those faculty and staff who assisted Dr. Heck in his study: those at Rockland Community College in Suffern, New York; DeKalb Community College in Atlanta, Georgia; and Daytona Beach Community College in Daytona Beach, Florida. Their willingness to provide the information necessary to conduct the research was commendable. Dr. Heck's complete dissertation is available through the University of Florida.


James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education

Gainesville, Florida

February, 1986

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Educators at our nation's community colleges have long recognized that students deficient in academic skills need coursework designed at an appropriate level of difficulty. The premise generally governing programs for the academically disadvantaged is that all students should be encouraged to realize more fully their potential by participating in courses which match their ability level. This "same premise furnishes the rationale" for an honors program intended to serve the needs of both the academically gifted and highly motivated student (Austin, 1975, p. 161). Whereas "the unique educational needs of handicapped, mature, international, and developmental students" have long been given a great deal of attention, the special needs of the talented and gifted students are not as frequently addressed (National Collegiate Honors Council, 1983, p. 1). In fact, a 1975 survey of the entire membership of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges revealed that out of 664 respondents, only 47 community colleges had developed formalized programs for the gifted (Olivas, 1975, p. 1).

This dearth of accelerated programs occurs at a time when the number of "high ability" students attending the two-year colleges is "growing" (National Collegiate Honors Council, 1983, p. 1). An article in the Community and Junior College Journal reported that approximately 20 percent of the entering freshmen in community colleges were in the upper

quarter of their graduating high school class (Bay, 1978, p. 18). It is projected, moreover, that as the cost of tuition in four-year institutions continues to increase, and as available financial aid declines, more academically-talented students will be attending local community colleges (National Collegiate Honors Council, 1983).

As reported by the National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC), research has shown that a large number of exceptionally talented students permanently drop out of college (NCHC, 1983). One such investigation, conducted by Alexander W. Astin, reported the findings of a nationwide study of 41,356 undergraduates at 358 representative two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities (Astin, 1975, pp. 3-4). This longitudinal, follow-up report found that dropouts tend to list "boredom with courses" as the most important reason for leaving college. Astin stated that while "one can argue that boredom or dissatisfaction with requirements represents a handy rationalization for failure which in reality is attributable to other causes (poor academic performance, for example). . . nevertheless, fully 18 percent of the students who give boredom as a reason for leaving college actually have average grades of B or higher" (1975, p. 17). Astin, therefore, advanced the notion that many highly talented students drop out of college because they do not feel appropriately challenged. He stated that

these findings suggest that the academic programs of many undergraduate institutions fail to capture the interest of substantial numbers of students, including some of the highest achievers. Boredom with courses may be an important factor in the decision of many able students to leave college. (1975, p. 17)

Another study directed specifically at the community college student produced similar results (Farnsworth, 1982). In fact, this

study suggested that community college students who are identified as highly talented are as likely to drop out as are other groups of students. If community college leaders value the opportunity to retain the growing number of talented students attending their institutions, it is time to provide more programs specifically designed to meet the needs of those students.

In addition to this increase of academically-talented students attending community colleges, other far-reaching environmental trends also serve to heighten the need for community college honors programs. Finn (1981) saw the primary focus of education at all levels in the eighties as being the achievement of quality. Another writer perceived a general shift toward the "achievement of quality in the eighties" occurring throughout our nation's community colleges (Friedlander, 1983, p. 26). Piland and Azbell (1984) noted a similar shift. Such influential national reports as A Nation At Risk, also have emphasized the need for our country's educational system to make a concerted effort toward establishing more rigorous programs, especially for those students considered to be academically gifted (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

In response to such specific factors, some community college leaders are beginning to stress the need to plan and implement honors programs. They maintain that "while high-cost, labor intensive, developmental programs seem to be an accepted part" of the curriculum, too often it is "erroneously assumed that bright students do not need any help or encouragement to succeed" (Piland

& Gould, 1982, p. 26). As quoted in a recent NCHC (1983) publication, Dr. Robert McCabe, President of Miami-Dade Community College, stated that

with an increased focus on achievement in the community college, it is important that these institutions not become places for only those with poor academic skills. Yet, overwhelmed by the problems of the unprepared and the task of providing support to them, the community college has, over a period of time, neglected superior students. These students represent one aspect of our total diversity, and they can be well served in community colleges. The superior student is an important asset, not only to other students, but also in building and maintaining a positive public attitude towards the community college. (p. 4)

As McCabe implied, the need for "academic balance" (NCHC, 1983, p. 4) suggests that a well-designed honors program deserves a place in community colleges. Like McCabe, Paul Elsner, Chancellor of the Maricopa County College District in Arizona supported the development of honors programs at community colleges. During testimony before the California Post-secondary Education Commission, he described the honors programs at Maricopa Community Colleges. Following this description, Elsner affirmed his commitment to the programs by stating that "it is our hope that we can provide that kind of opportunity on a continuing basis" (Elsner, 1984, p. 4-5).

As community college leaders begin to plan for the origination of new honors programs, or the expansion of existing programs, information regarding the establishment and continuation of community college honors programs should prove beneficial. This study will provide academic decision makers with this information.

Statement of the Problem

Levine (1980) suggested that "the process of innovation . . . involves a series of predictable, sequential steps" (p. 6). Although these steps may be "predictable and sequential," frequently academic innovation is terminated "prior to achieving its intended purpose" (Levine, 1980, p. 9). Levine also noted that "unfortunately, there is little in the way of consensus among the studies about how many steps there might be in the sequence or what the individual steps are" (p. 6). This lack of consensus concerning the number and characteristics of the stages involved in academic innovation renders it difficult for academic decision makers to plan for all of the phases in the "life cycle" (Martorana & Kuhns, 1975, p. 179) of a successful innovation. Information regarding the sequence of events involved in a particular type of innovation within a specific institutional context may prove to be useful.

This study, therefore, sought to answer the following question: Does the theory of academic innovation as described by Martorana and Kuhns in their "Interactive Forces Theory" describe the sequence of events employed in the establishment and continuation of honors programs at selected community colleges? Specifically, the researcher sought to determine whether the strategies and tactics employed in the establishment and continuation of well established honors programs at selected community colleges followed the five finite stages that Martorana and Kuhns theorized for academic innovations.

The following subsidiary questions were also suggested:

1. Can the strategies and tactics employed by the selected community colleges that have successfully established the innovation of an

honors program be classified under the five stages identified by Martorana and Kuhns?

2. Were at least two of the three community colleges selected for study identified as having experienced the five developmental stages outlined by Martorana and Kuhns in the process of establishing and continuing their honors programs?

Justification for the Study

When compared to the total number of community colleges in our nation, only a relative few appear to have fully implemented college-wide honors programs (Olivas, 1975; Phillips, 1973). An interest, however, is presently growing to establish more of the programs (Friedlander, 1983; National Collegiate Honors Council, 1983). According to a NCHC (1983) publication, "in the past five years, the comprehensive mission of the two-year college has expanded to include the special needs of talented and gifted students" (p. 1). As Friedlander (1983) stated

the primary concern of community college educators has moved from the attainment of equity in the sixties and the seventies to the achievement of quality education in the eighties. One manifestation of this movement toward quality education is the revival of honors programs. (p. 26)

Piland and Gould (1982) also observed an increased interest in establishing honors programs and stated that, "an honors program would seem an appropriate service to the gifted students of the community" (p. 25). Similarly, Bay (1978) perceived a need to establish and maintain more honors programs at the community college level and suggested that these goals "deserve faculty attention and administrative support" (p. 18). Furthermore, an informal survey of chief academic administrators at

community colleges in Florida and thirteen other eastern states which was conducted by this writer in the fall of 1983, also suggested that there is a growing interest in establishing new honors programs. Out of twenty-seven returned questionnaires in which the respondents indicated that their respective colleges did not have an honors program, twenty-one indicated that they felt an honors program should be included in a community college curriculum.

As previously mentioned, this developing interest in establishing honors programs in community colleges occurs concurrently with the growing emphasis presently being placed upon quality throughout our nation's educational system. This study applied a theory of academic change to the practical problems encountered in developing strategies and tactics for implementing honors programs, and provides academic decision makers with knowledge concerning the successful development of these programs. Since very little formal research has been conducted in the area of community college honors programs, this study serves to provide much needed information in the field.

Assumptions

Some educators argue that the very concept of having an honors program at community colleges is inconsistent with that institution's stated mission of providing equal educational opportunity for all. Piland and Gould (1982) summarized some of these arguments in their survey of 48 Illinois community colleges. They stated

some respondents reported definite reasons against honors programs. These negative reactions included a fear of isolating

bright students, a belief that students would not participate in such a program, and that there were not enough academically talented students to warrant a program. (p. 26)

In addition, other writers have noted that honors programs are often subject to charges of elitism (Daniel, 1978; Rother, 1978; Smith, 1981; Straus, 1976; Weir, 1976). As Daniel (1978) suggested

there seem always to be a few friendly or not so friendly elements within higher education who perceive Honors as an elitist, undemocratic aristocracy seeking to increase the advantages of the advantaged. (p. 17)

The critics that Daniel and others write of maintain that the selective admission process and special incentive programs frequently employed in honors programs violate the spirit of equalitarianism which has become an important aspect of American higher education. Supporters of honors programs contend, however, that equal educational opportunity means that each student should be provided the chance to "realize" his or her own potential (NCHC, 1983, p. 2). These supporters appear to adhere to the philosophy expressed by John Gardner (1961) in his classic work, Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? In this work and in the recently revised edition (1984), Gardner explored the issues of excellence and equalitarianism. He stated .

extreme equalitarianism--or as I would prefer to say, equalitarianism wrongly conceived--which ignores differences in native capacity and achievement, has not served democracy well. Carried far enough, it means the lopping off of any heads which come above dead level. It means committee rule, the individual smothered by the group. And it means the end of that striving for excellence which has produced mankind's greatest achievements. (p. 15)

Honors programs, along with programs for disadvantaged and remedial students, are developed to meet the diverse needs of students. They therefore assist community colleges in actually fulfilling their

mission. Within this study, the assumption has been made that honors programs have an important role in community colleges, and that discovering successful strategies and tactics currently available for use in implementing these programs is a worthwhile task.

In addition to propounding the position that honors programs deserve a place in the community college curriculum, a significant methodological assumption is also inherent in this study. The researcher assumed that an ex post facto case study approach to answering this particular problem statement was the most appropriate approach. The limitations of quantitative data collected from responses to questionnaires, such as the limitations related to the "writing skills of respondents, the impossibility of probing or extending responses, and the effort required of the person completing the questionnaire" (Patton, 1980, p. 29), render a statistical analysis of a written survey inappropriate. Rather, the researcher "seeks to capture what people have to say in their own words" (Patton, 1980, p. 29). The intent, therefore, was not to provide statistical analysis, but to provide qualitative data that ascertain what "people's lives, experiences, and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in their natural surroundings" (Patton, 1980, p. 22).

Procedures

The researcher conducted an informal survey regarding community college honors programs in the fall of 1983. This three page survey was sent to the chief academic administrator at twenty-eight community colleges in Florida, three randomly selected community colleges in each of thirteen Eastern states, and thirteen other community colleges listed

as "participating colleges" in a NCHC study entitled, Honors in the Two Year College (1983). (A copy of this survey appears in Appendix C.) Answers to the following questions were sought: (1) Did the institution have a college-wide honors program? (2) If so, what were its essential components? (3) What suggestions could the respondents offer to those interested in establishing new programs? Essentially, this survey assisted the researcher in determining the nature of current community college honors programs and in identifying those colleges that apparently have well developed programs.

After reviewing the surveys, three colleges that were determined to have well established programs were selected for further study. The guidelines used to select the three colleges included the following criteria:

1. The colleges selected met eight or more of the recommendations listed in the fifteen-point statement "Major Features of a Full Honors Program." This statement was issued by the Inter-university Committee on the Superior Student (ICSS), and appears in a NCHC publication, Handbook for the Evaluation of an Honors Program (NCHC, no date). Although the ICSS recommendations are not specifically designed for community colleges, this statement, nevertheless, served as a useful tool for evaluating community college programs.
2. The colleges selected had historical data available to the researcher.

3. Individuals that were directly involved in the development of honors programs at their respective colleges were available for interviews.

The three colleges selected for study were as follows: Daytona Beach Community College (DBCC) in Daytona Beach, Florida; DeKalb Community College (DCC) in Atlanta, Georgia; and Rockland Community College (RCC) in Suffern, New York.

Upon selection of the colleges, the qualitative research methods of conducting open-ended interviews and examining related documents were employed to collect the data. All interviews were tape recorded using a cassette tape recorder. Documents examined included committee meeting minutes, personal and group memos, newspaper clippings, various proposals, and other miscellaneous materials. A list of the persons interviewed with their corresponding professional titles and college affiliations appears in Appendix D.

Using aspects of Martorana and Kuhns' "Interactive Forces Theory" (outlined in their book, Managing Academic Change, 1975) as a structural framework and with their personal assistance, the possible strategies and tactics were developed from the review of literature. The possible strategies and tactics for planning and implementing an honors program were divided for this study into five developmental stages: exploration, formulation, trial, refinement, and institutionalization. For each stage, three possible strategies were outlined. For each strategy outlined, several tactics were suggested as possible means toward implementing the particular strategy.

After the list of possible strategies and tactics was compiled, a checklist was developed which was used as an interview guide (see Appendix A). Using the guidelines set forth in Patton's (1980) book, Qualitative Evaluation Methods, the "general interview guide approach" was employed. Honors program coordinators and other pertinent college officers were asked to evaluate if the strategies and tactics were employed during the establishment of their respective programs. They also were asked to suggest any other strategies and tactics, relevant to each developmental stage, not appearing on the checklist that were employed. In addition, any available documents that may have supported the observations of the respondents were examined.

Upon determining that at least two strategies specifically related to each developmental stage had been employed, it was concluded that evidence had been shown of the responding college's experiencing those particular developmental stages. The researcher made this determination if a simple majority of the individuals interviewed and the documents examined indicated that such strategies had indeed been employed. If it was demonstrated that at least two strategies were employed for each of the five developmental stages, then Martorana and Kuhns' theory was considered valid for the implementation of community college honors programs being studied.

For the purposes of this investigation, if Martorana and Kuhns' "Interactive Forces Theory" was judged to be valid for two of the three colleges studied, the theory was considered a valid description of the stages of development that well established honors programs follow during the maturation process.

Once the data were collected and evaluated, specific recommendations as to the most effective strategies and tactics employed in developing successful community college honors programs were offered. These recommendations are structured around the developmental stages of academic innovation, presented in Martorana and Kuhns "Interactive Forces Theory." Using these recommendations as a guide, academic decision makers will be afforded the opportunity to determine if the sequence of events involved in successful academic innovation theorized by Martorana and Kuhns appears to be valid, and to study what have been found to be the most effective strategies and tactics at each stage of program development.

Summary of Literature Review

The literature related to the development of honors programs in American higher education and that related specifically to honors programs in community colleges is not exhaustive. Much of what has appeared consists of short journal articles appearing in Forum for Honors, or The Community Junior College Journal. Very few full-length studies were found to exist. Among these, Aydelotte's (1944) pioneering work entitled Breaking The Academic Lock Step: The Development of Honors Work in American Colleges and Universities and Joseph Cohen's (1966c) The Superior Student in America remain the most notable. A 1983 publication of the National Collegiate Honors Council, entitled Honors in the Two Year College is the most significant work to date for the community college.

Perhaps because the topic itself has not received extensive attention from researchers, it is difficult to outline strong thematic currents recurring in the literature. Several concerns, however, seem to be most prevalent. These concerns include historical origins, current status of programs, rationale and goal statements, admission criteria, faculty selection and incentives, administrative networks, evaluation of programs, and attempts to answer the charges of elitism.

The amount of literature dealing with the process of curriculum change, unlike that dealing specifically with honors programs, is very extensive. For the purposes of this study, those writers who appeared to exert particular influence upon the development of Martorana and Kuhns' "Interactive Forces Theory" were mentioned in the full length dissertation. Also, a summary of the theory itself was presented. The writers mentioned included, among others, Kurt Lewin, J. T. Hefferlin,

Warren Bennis, Lewis Mayhew, and Patrick Ford. These writers' and other change theorists' contributions led to the development of the "Interactive Forces Theory" outlined in Managing Academic Change (1975).

CHAPTER II RESULTS

The central concern of this study was whether or not aspects of the theory of academic innovation, as described by Martorana and Kuhns (1975) in their "Interactive Forces Theory," describe the sequence of events employed in the establishment and continuation of honors programs at selected community colleges. The Results section was, therefore, structured according to the major elements of that theory. Because the interview guide was used as the key instrument throughout data collection and analysis, much of the narrative of the Results section was organized around this guide. Occasionally, a strategy or tactic that did not appear on the interview guide was identified by the researcher. In accordance with the procedures set forth in Chapter I, if the strategy or tactic could be classified into one of the five stages of academic innovation as defined by Martorana and Kuhns, it was included in the narrative.

Exploration Stage

All three institutions progressed through a clearly discernible exploration stage. Each honors program studied traced its early origins to a small offering of courses initiated by a few instructors, working for the most part independently of each other. These honors courses did not, however, constitute an organized college-wide approach that could be identified as a well established program. Generally speaking, an honors

program began to evolve when a top-level administrator, respected faculty member, or group of faculty members determined that an honors program should be established.

The dean of student services at RCC, for example, mentioned that the major impetus for their honors program came from a general realization on the part of the faculty and administration that their institution was doing a "better job with the average student and with the developmental student than with the student at the other end of the academic spectrum" (D. J. Lowdermilk, personal communication, June 15, 1984). This administrator also stated that in order for the comprehensive mission of their college to be realized, needs of students of all academic aptitudes should be addressed.

All three of the institutions employed a variety of tactics to pursue Strategy A (create a demand for an honors program). One of the most frequently mentioned tactics was the identification of a top-level administrator who would support the establishment of the program, and emphasize the need for such a program. The honors program director at DBCC, for one, explained the situation in this manner: "You need a top administrator and a dynamic administrator. You must hitch your wagon to a star. By that I mean you must find an administrator that can get things done" (B. Sharp, personal communication, May 1, 1984).

Individuals at all three study sites stressed that their programs could not have become well established without securing administrative support. Although faculty at the three colleges seemed to receive administrative support at various stages of the planning process, and in varying degrees, all apparently received such support in one form or

another. At DCC, the vice-president for academic affairs was involved while she was still a faculty member in planning and teaching honors courses long before a college-wide program was initiated (M. Nesbitt, personal communication, May 16, 1984; R. Clow, personal communication, May 16, 1984). This type of coincidence helped to ensure that administrative support would be forthcoming in this particular instance.

Many other tactics that are associated with Strategy A were identified. Most prominent among these was the conducting of informal meetings to share perceptions and outline needs. This generally took two forms. First, faculty recognized the need for an honors program from their direct contact with students in the classroom. They then informally shared their perception of this need with other faculty and administrators. Second, administrators realized a need for an honors program from interactions with various community groups, and shared this information with faculty and administrative groups. Many variations of this tactic were employed, but the general pattern consisted of a concerned faculty and/or administrator sensing the need and beginning to communicate that need whenever possible. In all three instances, a detailed written needs analysis usually was included in the formal proposal submitted later by the planning committee for the honors program.

Likewise, at all three institutions, Strategy B (form honors planning committee) was employed. At RCC the planning committee consisted of all full professors meeting once a month. According to the co-director of that program, the intent behind such meetings was to evaluate the entire academic curriculum of the institution. One of the results, however, was a report stating that not enough was being done for the gifted and

talented student, and that an honors program should be formed (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984).

At DCC, a top-level administrator, in conjunction with the vice-president of academic affairs, appointed faculty to an honors planning committee. These faculty members either had previously expressed interest in an honors program, or had been recommended for participation by their division chairpersons. A memo sent to specific faculty members appointed the committee, set the agenda, assigned sub-committees, and described the responsibilities of individual members. The administrator was careful to appoint faculty from a wide variety of disciplines to ensure that the committee was representative of the college. This administrator described his actions in the following manner:

My strategy in creating the committee was to have members correspond to the three main areas of the curriculum. Also, we wanted to have a sampling from each campus. In that way, representatives from all the campuses and every area of the curriculum could feel a sense of ownership regarding the resulting program. (R. L. Swofford, personal communication, May 14, 1984)

At DBCC, a memo was distributed to faculty in an attempt to survey the interest of the faculty in teaching honors courses. A faculty member, who later was appointed chairperson of the ad hoc committee, made the following comments: "We surveyed the interest of the faculty in teaching honors courses before we did almost anything else. We surveyed them first, rather than first telling them our concept of an honors program" (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, May 8, 1984). The respondents to that survey eventually became the ten members of the ad hoc committee, whose purpose was to design a proposal for an honors

program. According to the vice-president for academic affairs, the DBCC honors program was "initiated through a very democratic process. Faculty from several disciplines banded together to initiate the planning" (C. P. Cornelius, personal communication, April 30, 1984).

All three colleges, moreover, exhibited evidence of employing Strategy C (create a formal proposal for an honors program). At RCC, the proposal took the form of a report issued by the full professors on campus which called for more concerted efforts to meet the needs of the academically talented student. Details of the program were later developed by its two co-directors. At DBCC and DCC, the proposal was written by the respective planning committees, and then was distributed to such groups as the faculty senate, academic affairs committee, and the administrative cabinet. The respective committees used a multitude of tactics to reach their proposal. All three committees, in some manner, attempted to reach consensus on the twelve issues listed in Tactic C4 of the Exploration Stage on the Interview Guide. At DCC, the committee was guided by a clear set of objectives and a specific agenda. According to the honors director at the north campus, the "proposal moved through a number of drafts" (J. A. Michna, personal communication, May 14, 1984). A central group of members "worked out many of the details for the rest of the committee to approve; the committee secretary then drafted the proposal" (J. A. Michna, personal communication, May 14, 1984).

Individuals at all three campuses stressed the value of communicating with other institutions and with national and regional honors organizations while formulating their proposals. A faculty member at DBCC expressed it in this manner: "Talk to the nation" (P. A. Drimmel,

personal communication, May 8, 1984). By this, he indicated that determining how other institutions planned and implemented their programs was extremely valuable. This individual particularly stressed the worth of attending the national and regional conferences of the NCHC. This same person repeatedly mentioned the need to secure funding for the program early in the planning process to ensure that travel to other institutions and conferences, along with other related planning activities, would be possible.

A campus program director at DCC stated that communicating with senior institutions in the general geographic area also was particularly helpful during the formulation of the proposal. This director made three statements in this regard:

We knowingly tried to evaluate what other four-year colleges and universities in the general area were doing in regard to honors . . . We sought as much information as possible from neighboring institutions. . . . Early in the planning process we thought carefully about how our students would be received by senior institutions. (J. A. Michna, personal communication, May 14, 1984)

Numerous other tactics were employed in the process of formulating the written proposal. Those mentioned in this section of the narrative, however, were the tactics most frequently stressed at the study sites.

Various other strategies were identified that could be classified within the exploration stage of this study. It was clear, however, that the planners at all three study sites employed at least all of these three strategies: Strategy A (create a demand for an honors program), Strategy B (form an honors planning committee), and Strategy C (create a formal proposal for an honors program).

Formulation Stage

Upon the creation of its proposal, each college entered into the formulation stage of development. As theorized by Martorana and Kuhns (1975), during this stage of development the planners at each institution pursued strategies which enabled them to compile information relative to the "elements and issues identified during the exploration stage" (p. 179). Tactics associated with Strategy A of the formulation stage (formal proposal circulated, discussed and modified), and Strategy C (address faculty development needs), were identified at all the study sites. There was insufficient evidence, however, to state unequivocally that Strategy B (determine obstacles and confront opposition) was employed.

At RCC, the aforementioned report issued by the full professors in 1977 was widely circulated and discussed. According to the co-director of the program, it was largely because the report was issued by a group with many significant leaders involved, that it was "circulated and discussed among the entire college" (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984). This report was readily endorsed, while no evidence of modification could be detected.

At DCC, the proposal was circulated and discussed both formally and informally. Primarily because the planning committee was large and representative of the total college, much of the discussion and modification took place at the planning committee's meetings prior to the circulation of the proposal. After receiving a thorough discussion within the committee, the proposal was formally circulated and discussed in the faculty senate, the academic affairs committee, and the district

administrative cabinet. Modifications were made in the original proposal following these discussions.

At DBCC, memos were sent to department chairpersons by the chairperson of the ad hoc committee describing the proposal (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, September 24, 1975). Several days later, the dean of arts and sciences was sent a summary of the significant features of the ad hoc committee's recommendations (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, September 28, 1975). Subsequently, the proposal was sent to the vice-president for academic affairs. Student services personnel were then contacted after the plan had been approved. More significant contact with student services personnel was initiated after an honors council was formed. For example, according to the minutes of the honors council meeting of October 19, 1976, the honors faculty formally met with appropriate counselors in an effort to work out necessary details (Honors Council minutes, DBCC, October 19, 1976). Additional interactions among counselors and honors faculty within all three colleges will be discussed in the "Institutionalization Stage" of this section.

A significant amount of literature reviewed in Chapter I of this study stressed the need to determine obstacles and confront opposition when developing honors programs. The focus of much of these particular comments was upon the need to formulate counter-arguments to charges of elitism frequently leveled against honors programs. At all three study sites, however, little evidence of opposition could be discovered, and it follows that little activity occurred which was designed to confront this opposition.

At DBCC, the chairman of the ad hoc committee stated the following in this regard:

Opposition completely failed to materialized. There was absolutely no resentment from the Vo-Tech sector concerning any funds that were devoted to the honors program. Similarly, there was no resentment from our colleagues in the traditional academic areas. (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, May 8, 1984)

This same individual did add, however, that if opposition had arisen, the planners at DBCC would have "singled those opposing the plan out, invited them to the honors council meeting, and asked them to discuss their questions at the council meeting" (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, May 8, 1984). Apparently, the prevailing mood among those not directly involved in the early stages of the planning process at DBCC was more one of skepticism than opposition. All of the individuals interviewed at DBCC generally echoed these sentiments.

As with the other two study sites, DCC experienced little or no opposition. According to one administrator, "there was more complacency than opposition" (R. L. Swofford, personal communication, May 14, 1984). Other individuals repeated these comments and added that mainly because the college had such a strong developmental program, few faculty or administrators could justify opposing an honors program.

Similarly, RCC exhibited little evidence of confronting opposition. Apparently, when the full professors suggested that the college was ignoring some of its best students, the vast majority of faculty and administrators supported the idea. Upon the release of that report, program co-ordinators were signalled to "grab the ball and run with it" (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984). It seems that as a result of their careful planning, no organized opposition materialized.

Unlike Strategy B (determine obstacles and confront opposition) in the formulation stage, evidence of each study site experiencing Strategy C (addressing faculty development needs) existed. RCC probably experienced the least need for formal re-training of faculty because of the wealth of faculty members who had significant prior experience in teaching honors courses, or courses similar in nature to honors courses. Even under these circumstances, however, careful guidelines for teaching honors courses and for being an honors mentor were created and implemented by the co-directors. Perhaps the most frequently mentioned tactic associated with Strategy C, occurring at RCC, was the faculty meeting on a regular basis to discuss curriculum development and other related concerns. According to most of the individuals interviewed, there was a core of dedicated professors who had a "natural rapport" and were willing to devote extra time to helping each other develop their talents.

DBCC and DCC initiated similar faculty development activities such as developing guidelines for course development, and honors faculty informally meeting among themselves. Evidence also was located of visiting consultants helping to retrain faculty and travel funds which were made available for faculty members to visit other institutions and attend appropriate conferences.

There was, therefore, a clearly discernible formulation stage in the establishment and continuation of the honors programs at all three study sites. Although insufficient evidence existed to state that Strategy B

occurred, all three study sites clearly experienced Strategies A and C, and other miscellaneous strategies not mentioned in this narrative that could be classified under the Formulation Stage in Martorana and Kuhns' conceptualization.

Trial Stage

If one adheres rigidly to the definition of the trial stage set forth by Martorana and Kuhns (1975), then none of the study sites could be said to have passed through an explicit program trial period. Martorana and Kuhns stated that the trial stage consisted of a pilot operation limited in time and scope. No evidence could be discovered that the innovations at the three colleges received a mandate signifying that they were pilot operations limited in the above-mentioned manner.

Most of those addressing this question reported that if there had not been established a clear, definite commitment of support for an unspecified period of time, the program would have been successful. Most faculty members indicated that there would have been a decided lack of motivation, on their part, to develop and teach courses if the innovation had started as a pilot project. One faculty member's comments were representative of many that this researcher recorded:

It is a lukewarm commitment if the powers that be or even the participants, insist on a trial project. It discourages those who might take an interest, if they didn't know that it was going to be for more than one semester or one year. We were assured that we were in. (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, May 8, 1984)

A co-director at another study site for example, jokingly stated that "it was understood from the start that the program would go on for eternity" (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984). In another

instance, the former president of one of the colleges studied addressed the issue of a trial project in the following manner:

We never formalized a trial project. We never said that if the program doesn't work in three semesters, for example, we would discontinue it. You should not respond to any type of criticism by hedging your bets. You should meet any philosophical challenges to the premises of the program intellectually and not with the suggestion of a trial project. (S. Eskow, personal communication, October 3, 1984)

These sentiments were reiterated repeatedly during the interview process. It should be mentioned that although none of the study sites actually experienced Strategy A (begin trial project), individuals at all three study sites maintained that there was definitely an implied trial stage. As in all innovations, if the fledgling honors programs had dramatically failed to draw students after a significant amount of time had passed, they obviously would have been discontinued.

The only evidence that an explicit trial project occurred was uncovered at DBCC. This occurred not during the development of their honors program, per se, but much later during the planning of an interdisciplinary program developed as part of the honors program. This program, called Quanta, was given a one-semester mandate, according to one of its chief architects (R. Zelle, personal communication, May 1, 1984). At no other site was such a clearly discernible trial project in evidence.

The information gathered regarding Strategy B (initiate a careful evaluation and readjustment procedure) in the trial stage was not conclusive enough to state that this strategy occurred at all three study sites. None of the colleges appeared to set up formalized and elaborate

evaluation procedures. Although some honors faculty members seemed to observe evaluation procedures that surpassed what might normally occur, this did not constitute an elaborate process. Rather, all of the program directors at the study sites apparently relied on informal information gathered from faculty, students, and graduates of the program, to evaluate the efficacy of their honors programs.

All three study sites clearly showed evidence of experiencing Strategy C (identify and recruit students). The five tactics associated with this strategy, and listed in the Interview Guide, were all extensively employed by the three colleges. Perhaps the most frequently stressed tactic in this regard was Tactic C2 (initiate and develop liaisons with students, teachers, and administrators at local high schools). Although a great deal of recruitment activities occurred at each college, much of these activities should be categorized within the Institutionalization Stage of this narrative, and will be discussed there.

Although Strategy C of the trial stage was clearly in evidence at all three study sites, the researcher was unable to identify positively two strategies that could be classified under that heading. At each college, evidence that would have allowed the researcher to identify more than one strategy for the trial stage failed to materialize. The trial stage theorized by Martorana and Kuhns was, therefore, officially judged not to be valid within the confines of this study. If, however, Martorana and Kuhns' definition of the trial stage was to be more loosely interpreted, it could be stated that all three colleges experienced an implied trial stage resembling what Martorana and Kuhns described.

Refinement Stage

Insufficient evidence was discovered to determine that Strategy A (distribute results of the self-study and evaluation by external agents) and Strategy C (set up advisory committee of students and community representatives) of the refinement stage occurred. This was true for all of the three study sites. Strategy B (initiate follow-up studies of graduates of the trial program), however, was clearly initiated by all three colleges. This was true if the phrase "trial program" was interpreted to mean the beginning stages of the program. (As previously reported, no college underwent an official trial program.)

Strategy B was the only strategy specifically listed in the refinement stage of the Interview Guide that was identified at all three study sites. However, other strategies not listed on the Interview Guide, but clearly associated with the refinement stage as defined by Martorana and Kuhns, were identified. Each college, therefore, produced verification of initiating at least two strategies associated with this particular stage. Thus, the researcher was able to determine that the refinement stage, as theorized by Martorana and Kuhns, was valid for the purposes of this study.

While none of the colleges participated in a formal evaluation, the researcher was obviously unable to substantiate the occurrence of Strategy A. As reported in the Trial Stage of this narrative, the majority of evaluation procedures which occurred at the three study sites was informal in nature. It follows, then, that the results of such evaluation would have been distributed in an informal and unofficial manner.

The most frequently mentioned reason for not initiating Strategy C was the constraints of time on students and community representatives. There occurred a significant amount of contact with students and community leaders that could be described as advisory in nature. All of this, however apparently was conducted on an informal basis. One college established an extra-curricular club through which informal advising occurred. At another college, students traveled with honors faculty to national and regional conferences, during which discussions of an advisory nature occurred. In no instance, though, were formal advisory committees organized.

Unlike Strategies A and C in the Refinement Stage, Strategy B (initiate follow-up studies of graduates of the trial program) received a great deal of attention. Personnel at both DBCC and DCC conducted follow-up studies through such activities as telephoning graduates, writing individual letters to graduates, and sending a standard survey to graduates. Program co-directors at RCC, however, did extensive work in this regard, some of which will be briefly outlined.

Most of the individuals interviewed at RCC stressed their belief that one test of program effectiveness is the choice of future directions made by students following their graduation. There was significant evidence to document that substantial efforts were made to follow the progress of program graduates. A co-director of RCC's program described their procedures in the following manner:

We send out questionnaires to all the graduates of our program asking them how they are doing in transfer institutions. We send them formal follow-up questionnaires which are consistently returned. The questionnaires enable us to document that 98 percent of our graduates

have maintained a B (Grade Point Average) or better at transfer institutions. (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984)

A newspaper article described the results of one such follow-up study, reporting that "the study, tracing 100 graduates from 1978 to the present, showed that all the students in the honors program went on to four-year institutions" (Winters, 1982, p. 5). This same newspaper article quoted the former vice-president for instructional services, and current president of the college, in the following manner: "Study results further show that all the honors students completed their studies at a four-year institution with a grade average equal to or higher than the average they had at RCC" (p. 5).

Members of the office for student services staff outlined additional follow-up activities. These included individual case studies that were developed describing honors program graduates. Through these case studies, information was compiled, including "where the graduates went, what their majors are, and eventually what their professions are" (J. Cohen, personal communication, June 19, 1984). Portions of these written case studies appeared in brochures and in additional newspaper articles. They were also read at open house events.

RCC also maintained an ongoing directory of its graduates. This directory lists the student's name, high school, honors and scholarships, and transfer institutions. This directory also included a list of each institution which accepted the graduates of the program. One faculty member at RCC summarized the follow-up activities by stating

we have the equivalent of an alumni association. Graduates are frequently invited back to campus. We receive letters from them. There is an intellectual underground (among faculty, graduates, and current students) that begins to grow. This is one of the rich

elements of the program. (J. M. Pirone, personal communication, June 19, 1984)

In addition to Strategy B, numerous other strategies not listed on the Interview Guide but clearly associated with the refinement stage (as defined by Martorana and Kuhns) were identified. Primary among these strategies were the following: Increased travel to national and regional conferences, increased communication with senior institutions, additional release time offered to program directors and faculty in order to sharpen the focus and design of the program, refining of program brochures and other pertinent literature, and redesigning courses and course materials.

Institutionalization Stage

All three study sites experienced a clearly discernible institutionalization stage. In fact, the researcher was able to locate more evidence of strategies and tactics that could be associated with the institutionalization stage than with any other stage included in Martorana and Kuhns' theory. Perhaps this abundance of activity occurred because by the very definition offered by Martorana and Kuhns, this stage encompassed the longest period of time. It could be maintained that once a program has passed through the refinement stage, every activity that enables the program to continue and develop should be considered as part of the institutionalization stage.

Strategy A (select personnel for decision-making positions) was an important step in the institutionalization process at all three of the study sites. Although the three colleges selected their decision-making personnel at different stages in the time span of their planning, all had a clearly established administrative framework. Usually this

administrative framework included a program director, who was the chief officer responsible for the daily operation of the entire program.

At DCC, there was a program director for each of the three campuses. The three campus program directors met regularly in an effort to formulate an honors program council. The chairperson of this council served as the college-wide coordinator and was selected from the membership on a regular basis. An internal memo from a district administrator to the academic affairs council outlined the responsibilities of the campus honors coordinators and assigned to them a stipend of approximately \$900.00 per year (R. L. Swofford, personal communication, February 14, 1983). The honors coordinators at the three campuses were responsible to the academic dean at each campus, and through the campus academic dean to the district vice-president for academic affairs. The greatest advantage to this administrative framework, according to one campus coordinator, was that "centralized class scheduling could be done by one administrator" (S. M. Thomas, personal communication, May 15, 1984).

At RCC, two co-directors administered the daily operation of the program. In addition to teaching responsibilities, these two co-directors were responsible for the vast majority of planning, scheduling, and recruitment activities. These co-directors were responsible to the vice-president for academic affairs.

Likewise, DBCC had a program director who was assigned the responsibility of overseeing the entire program. Unlike DCC and RCC, the program director at DBCC did not have honors teaching responsibilities. According to several faculty members, the concept behind separating the

program director from honors teaching responsibilities was based upon the belief that he or she could better administer the informal faculty evaluation involved with the position if he or she were not also teaching.

In addition to a program director, DBCC had an honors council composed of interested faculty members. Like the program director, members of the honors council did not teach within the honors program itself. Their task was to provide guidance to the program director. Minutes of the honors council meetings revealed that it met on a regular basis and provided guidance on such crucial issues as course approval and faculty selection. The honors council was responsible to the vice-president for academic affairs. One faculty member at DBCC suggested that the administrative framework should be decided as soon as possible, and that "you should be firmed up on who is going to do what in the early days" (P. A. Drimmel, personal communication, May 8, 1984).

Funding for the three honors programs studied took various forms. While many individuals stressed the need for their program to have an independent budget, others saw no such need. One such individual stated

there is no need for a budget. Whenever we need money, money is found. No one is paid to do anything. Perhaps in the future, program mentors should be given a stipend. (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984)

Generally, if funds were needed for such items as clerical assistance, brochures, travel, special events, colloquiums, and release time for faculty, they were secured in one of two ways or through a combination of both. First, various academic departments shared the costs. In some instances this occurred on a regularly rotating basis. Second, the vice-president for academic affairs would allocate money on

an "as needed" basis, directly from his or her budget. At all of the colleges, the vice-president of academic affairs was consistently sent information regarding the honors programs, at least partially with the implicit intent of securing future funding.

Strategy B (establish permanent office locations) was an important strategy in the institutionalization stage at all three study sites. All of the program directors used their faculty offices as the main office for their honors program. Consequently, it was clear that each campus had a central physical location for honors activity.

Likewise, all program directors had clerical assistance available to them. This usually took the form of assistance from departmental secretaries, secretaries to the vice-president for academic affairs, or student assistance. However, although all program directors had assistance, few felt that what they received was adequate. One former director of the honors council at DBCC stated, "We have always received clerical assistance, but unfortunately it has not been adequate. Adequate clerical assistance is essential" (C. S. Lightsey, personal communication, May 1, 1984).

There was disagreement on the appropriateness of pursuing the tactics of establishing an honors lounge and an honors library. Individuals at DBCC stated that they had been working toward realizing those goals for years and felt that having both a library and lounge would be a tremendous advantage. According to the program director, after great efforts had been made, they had finally been given the necessary facilities to develop a special lounge and library. At the time of this study, final plans were being made for those facilities at DBCC.

Individuals at DCC generally thought that having an honors lounge and library might be advantageous, but it was not a program priority. Two central reasons appeared to surface for this hesitancy. First, the space required for such a facility did not seem to exist at their campuses. Second, given the combination of high numbers of part-time commuter students and an abundance of various cultural activities in the Atlanta area, there was some doubt if the facility would receive sufficient use to warrant its establishment.

At RCC, there was a definite belief that establishing an honors lounge and library would not be productive. Faculty feared that establishing such a facility might represent, in the minds of other students, a blatant attempt to give special privileges to a small group of students. Second, and more importantly, was that it was envisioned as unnecessary and as having a poor chance of being utilized by the students. Most honors lounges and libraries are initiated with the intent of developing a sense of community and exchange among honors students. At RCC, most of the individuals interviewed mentioned that this sense of community already existed without the benefit of a lounge or library. A faculty member summarized it in the following manner:

Because the class size is limited, a sense of community begins to grow within the class itself. There doesn't seem to be a great deal of time for extracurricular activities, and so an honors lounge would probably be left unused. (T. Fitzpatrick, personal communication, June 19, 1984)

Most individuals at RCC stated that small classes and a sense of dedication on the part of the faculty and co-directors are the most important factors in developing a sense of community, and not the existence of a special lounge or library. This belief was expressed repeatedly during interviews with the various program participants at RCC.

All of the study sites refined methods for offering special recognition to program graduates during the institutionalization stage. The minutes of the honors council at DBCC, for instance, traced the decision to secure a silver seal on the diploma issued to all program participants (Minutes of Honors Council, November 23, 1976, DBCC). This general practice existed at the other study sites as well. In addition to a special seal on the diplomas, special notation during the commencement exercises, annual awards banquets, and specific notations on transcripts were some of the other incentives developed during the institutionalization stage.

Throughout the institutionalization stage, personnel associated with the honors programs at each of the study sites increased their attempts to offer transfer assistance to graduates of their program. This generally involved individualized efforts, beyond what the respective office for student services would offer to any student wishing to transfer to a senior institution.

Although attention was given to transfer assistance at all of the colleges, the honors program at RCC clearly emphasized this service as an integral part of their program. According to student service personnel at RCC, prior to the increased efforts to organize transfer assistance, senior institutions had not been receptive to transfer students graduating from RCC's honors program. One student service representative explained this by stating

senior institutions had not been accomodating to transfer students. Professor Draper (co-director of RCC's honors program) did a fine marketing job in convincing senior institutions that RCC had a fine program. He personally traveled to senior institutions such as Ivy League schools, and others like the University of Chicago, to talk

A copy of a staff and program development (SPD) application documented that funds were made available to this honors council director to support these recruitment activities (SDP application, March 31, 1978, DBCC). At all three of the study sites, program directors, honors council members, and faculty engaged in similar activities. In each instance, the need for personal and direct contact among honors program personnel and administrators, faculty, and students was deemed to be essential. Contact among program graduates and prospective students was also seen as very important. This contact usually took the form of program graduates accompanying faculty during site visits to local high schools, or program graduates attending open house functions and other various receptions held on the community college campus.

A great many of these increased recruitment activities consisted of refining and improving the incentives offered to students. This usually involved the development of scholarships, special recognition and transfer assistance. All of the study sites showed great interest in attracting increased numbers of talented students by improving their incentives in these three areas.

Scholarships were generally offered to the upper ten percent of the graduating seniors of local high schools. These scholarships usually took the form of a tuition waiver. In addition to scholarships being offered to students while they were at the community college, a significant effort was directed toward helping program participants secure scholarships to senior institutions at each study site. Frequently, senior institutions would offer scholarships specifically directed toward graduates of community college honors programs.

It was also apparent to the researcher that the well developed mentoring system provided to honors program participants helped to develop this desired sense of a learning community at RCC. Each student regularly met with a professor for academic counseling and academic enrichment. Usually the professor taught within an academic field of particular interest to the student. The mentor followed the progress of the student throughout his or her participation in the program. This arrangement provided a rich context within which a sense of community could grow. The establishment of this sense of community, largely developed through the mentor system with the added ingredient of smaller honors classes, precluded the need for an honors lounge.

After the initial success of their programs, the personnel at all three study sites turned a great deal of attention to employing Strategy C (increase recruitment activities). It was thought that attracting and retaining increasing numbers of appropriate honors students from the serving districts of the three community colleges would noticeably enhance the entire educational atmosphere of the respective colleges.

A great deal of this increased recruitment activity occurred at the local high schools. One Honors Council director summarized her activities by stating the following:

I took our students from the honors seminar and visited local high schools. I took an entire semester off to organize and implement recruitment at local high schools. I contacted counselors, teachers of advanced placement courses, and principals in order to arrange for our presentations. I personally talked to talented students from the local high schools and encouraged them to participate. I obtained a list of the students (to contact) from high school counselors and teachers. (C. S. Lightsey, personal communication, May 1, 1984)

with their admissions counselors. (T. Merkel, personal communication, June 19, 1984)

In this manner, the honors program at RCC was "pre sold" before individual applications arrived at senior institutions. Consequently, graduates of RCC's program often were more readily received by transfer institutions.

In addition to speaking directly with admissions personnel at senior institutions, many other forms of transfer assistance were clearly in evidence. Each deserving student received an intricate and precise letter of recommendation directed toward individual institutions. Samples of these letters examined by the researcher averaged three to four pages in length, and demonstrated a thoughtful and precise knowledge of the respective student's academic abilities. Examples of the student's written work were also included in the letters. Additionally, each of the student's applications to senior institutions were individually edited. A file of previous applications, completed by program graduates and reviewed by the co-directors and student service personnel, was available to current students for their perusal.

A special seminar was also organized with the intent of assisting honors program students with the transfer process. The dean of student services maintained that honors students are not necessarily more clearly decided about their career goals than other students. He stated that the assumption is often erroneously made that talented students do not need assistance in this regard. According to this dean, "We have consequently worked with Professor Draper to organize a special program to help (honors students) make decisions concerning the direction that they want

to go" (D. L. Lowdermilk, personal communication, June 19, 1984). This seminar also included training sessions designed to help honors students prepare for admissions interviews and other activities associated with transferring to senior institutions.

The co-director of the RCC honors program summarized their activities relating to transfer assistance by stating

we could not have reached first-rate students unless we promised them the Ivy League. We have fulfilled that promise. In the first graduating class, we had students admitted to the Ivy League and this has occurred ever since. This year, Yale has accepted its first transfer student from a community college. This student was a graduate of RCC's honors program. The same was true for Harvard and M.I.T. last year. (S. Draper, personal communication, June 19, 1984)

Additional tactics at all three study sites were employed in order to promote Strategy C (increase recruitment activity). Guidance counselors (both on campus and at local high schools) were provided with information that could be readily dispersed. At all three colleges, contact with guidance counselors was developed and maintained as an integral part of their recruitment efforts.

Throughout the institutionalization stage, evidence existed that a constant flow of printed information was received by guidance personnel sent directly from program planners. Frequently, brochures were refined and updated on a regular basis. Groups such as civic clubs and campus women's groups were also given information and received presentations. At one campus, a film and slide presentation documenting the success of the program was developed.

Evidence of program planners seeking and receiving favorable publicity from local newspapers and other media outlets also existed. At DCC, articles concerning the honors program appeared in local newspapers

and the college newspaper. Pictures of graduates also appeared in the newspapers. The honors program student association also published and distributed its own newsletter. A publication sent to all secondary school teachers in the serving district, entitled "Checkpoint," contained articles concerning DCC's honors program.

At DBCC, the student newspaper, The Bagpiper, and the largest local newspaper, The Daytona Beach News Journal, carried a series of articles that offered favorable publicity for the honors program. RCC enjoyed the same type of publicity.

Most of the newspaper articles could be divided into three different topical categories. First, articles offered a general history of the program (Bennett, 1979; Honors programs provide added learning, 1976). Second, articles outlined specific and unique program activities and assignments (Bennett, 1978; Carter, 1978; Cuttillo, 1977a). Third, some articles offered a profile of honors students and outlined their achievements (Cuttillo, 1977b; Nancy Kass and the M./T.S. Honors Program at RCC, 1983; Students receiving awards, 1977; Winters, 1982). Representatives at all the study sites indicated that with minimal effort, favorable publicity of this nature could be readily obtained from local newspapers.

In addition to Strategies A, B, and C listed on the Interview Guide, other strategies that could be classified within the institutionalization stage were identified. A great deal of ongoing activities that will not be specifically mentioned in this narrative, were found to occur during this stage of development. Having reviewed all of the data associated with the institutionalization stage, therefore, it can be stated that all

of the study sites demonstrated irrefutable evidence of experiencing that stage of development as theorized by Martorana and Kuhns.

The results of the data collection and analysis sections of this study are summarized in Table One. According the procedures, if a simple majority of evidence indicated that a particular strategy had been employed, that strategy was included within the matrix. If a particular strategy was employed, the letter corresponding to that strategy as listed on the Interview Guide was written within the appropriate cell. For example, if the letters "A" and "B" appear within a particular cell, that signifies that the researcher judged strategies "A" and "B" to be valid for that particular cell. If the letter "O" appears within the cell, it signifies that other strategies not listed on the Interview Guide, but clearly associated with the respective developmental stage, were identified.

If two or more strategies were identified for a particular cell, the word "Yes" appears in that cell. If the word "No" appears in the cell, it signifies that the researcher was unable to certify that the particular stage was experienced by the specific college. Table One appears below.

Table 1
Employment of Specific Strategies Across the Three
Study Sites

STUDY SITES	EXPLORATION	FORMULATION	TRIAL	REFINEMENT	INSTITUTIONALIZATION
DBCC	A,B,C,O YES	A,C,O YES	C NO	B,O YES	A,B,C,O YES
DCC	A,B,C,O YES	A,C,O YES	C NO	B,O YES	A,B,C,O YES
RCC	A,B,C,O YES	A,C,O YES	C NO	B,O YES	A,B,C,O YES

Summary of Results

Evidence demonstrating that at least two strategies corresponding to four of the five stages of development theorized by Martorana and Kuhns (1975) was located at each of the three study sites. It was therefore determined that the strategies and tactics employed in the establishment and continuation of well-established honors programs at the three selected community colleges followed four of the five stages of development. Strategies listed on the Interview Guide and others related to the specific stages, but not listed on the guide, were identified for the exploration, formulation, refinement and institutionalization stages.

Insufficient evidence existed to demonstrate that any of the three study sites experienced a trial stage. Strategy C (identify and recruit students) was clearly experienced by all of the colleges. However, the researcher was not able to identify any other strategies that

corresponded to Martorana and Kuhns' definition of a "trial stage." Consequently, no specifically mandated trial project was found to have occurred. It should be stated in this regard, though, that an implied and unofficial trial project seemed to have occurred at each of the study sites. If readers chose to assume a somewhat less rigid definition of a "trial stage," they could also conclude that all five of the stages were valid for the establishment and continuation of honors programs at community colleges. For the purposes of this study, however, only the exploration, formulation, refinement and institutionalization stages were qualitatively identified.

In addition to the central question posed by this study, two subsidiary questions also were posed in Chapter I. First, can the strategies and tactics employed by the selected community colleges that have successfully established the innovation of an honors program be categorized within the five stages identified by Martorana and Kuhns? Second, were at least two of the three colleges selected for study identified as having experienced the five developmental stages outlined by Martorana and Kuhns, in the process of establishing and continuing their programs?

The answer to the first question is undoubtedly "yes." All of the strategies and tactics identified could easily be categorized within one of the five stages. At no point could the researcher identify a strategy or tactic that had been employed, but that did not correspond to one of the stages theorized by Martorana and Kuhns. The answer to the second inquiry is that with the exception of the trial stage, it was concluded that all three of the colleges experienced the stages theorized by Martorana and Kuhns.

CHAPTER III DISCUSSION

Three concerns will be addressed before discussing the results of this study. First, it soon became apparent to this researcher while at the study sites, that the developmental stages theorized by Martorana and Kuhns did not have absolute time-sequence boundaries. In other words, strategies that could clearly be classified under one particular stage of development occasionally were being employed simultaneously with strategies that could clearly be classified under another stage of development. The organization of the results may give the impression that the strategies occurred in a specific time-sequence for each institution. Such an organization is utilized, however, simply for the purpose of clarity and does not represent actual temporal divisions. This should not be interpreted to mean that the processes of establishing and continuing the respective honors programs did not have distinct stages, but only that there existed a degree of temporal overlap among the stages.

Second, it also became apparent to this researcher that very few individuals at the study sites could articulate a comprehensive view of the establishment and continuation of honors programs. Most individuals were involved in particular stages of the development of their respective

honors programs and hence they possessed only partial knowledge of the history of them. Likewise, no one specific document offered a comprehensive view of the process. Thus, a comprehensive view of the stages of the establishment and continuation of the respective honors programs only emerged after data from many sources had been assembled.

Third, the amount of data collected precluded reporting every strategy and tactic identified. Therefore, only those strategies and tactics most frequently mentioned were represented in this study. It also should be mentioned in this regard that the planners of honors programs, like other innovators, had a limited amount of time, energy, and funds to devote to the establishment and continuation of their programs. One individual, for instance, mentioned to the researcher that in the best of all worlds, a number of additional strategies and tactics would have been worthwhile. But the constraints of time, energy and funds limited the number of strategies that actually could be attempted. The results of this study should, therefore, be viewed not only as a report of what the planners tried and found useful, but also as a record of what the planners were able realistically to attempt.

Discussion of Results

This study sought to answer the following question: Does the theory of academic innovation, as proposed by Martorana and Kuhns in their "Interactive Forces Theory," describe the sequence of events employed in the establishment and continuation of honors programs at selected community colleges? Specifically, the researcher attempted to determine whether the strategies and tactics employed in the establishment and continuation of well established honors programs at selected community

colleges followed the five finite stages that Martorana and Kuhns theorized for academic innovations.

The analysis of data collected yields a positive response to the central question of this study. As reported in Chapter II, evidence demonstrating that at least two strategies corresponding to four of Martorana and Kuhns' five stages of development was located at each of the three study sites. (See "Summary of Results" for a more detailed account of how the central and subsidiary questions of this study were answered.) It was therefore determined that the establishment and continuation of well-established honors programs at the three selected community colleges followed four of the five stages of development. Strategies listed on the Interview Guide, and others related to the specific stages, were identified for the exploration, formulation, refinement and institutionalization stages.

The fact that only four of the five developmental stages were identified consistently at all three of the study sites prompts speculation regarding the stage that was not in evidence: the trial stage. Martorana and Kuhns theorized that trial projects occur during the establishment of successful innovations. Therefore, the following question arises: Why were trial projects not in existence during the process of establishing successful honors programs at community colleges?

Two explanations seem plausible. First, community colleges have historically emphasized strong developmental programs. With developmental studies firmly established at community colleges, and a general trend toward the establishment of higher standards building throughout American higher education, perhaps the need for honors programs at community colleges became relatively apparent. It is

possible that the absence of trial projects in the development of these programs is a result of the broad based support that such programs received.

A second reason why trial programs did not materialize may be related to the relative lack of controversy surrounding the development of honors programs. Once the need for such a program was perceived, the specific process of implementing the program drew little criticism. A significant portion of Martorana and Kuhns' theory addressed the kind of academic change that is fraught with controversy. Hence, Martorana and Kuhns' (1975) reported upon "change managers (who) avoided rejection by proposing the changes for only an experimental period, after which the innovative program was to be evaluated" (p. 169). Unlike these change managers, community college leaders involved in the establishment and continuation of the honors programs chosen for this study drew far less criticism than the programs traced by Martorana and Kuhns. This may be largely due to the relatively small number of faculty and students typically involved in implementing the honors programs. Also, the program's faculty usually received little or no extra compensation for a significant amount of extra work. Therefore, the program usually required a very small allocation of funds.

For these reasons, the honors programs usually drew little opposition. Unlike many of the innovations outlined in Martorana and Kuhns' work, these programs required no trial phase.

While the trial stage was not employed at all of the three study sites, the exploration, formulation, refinement and institutionalization stages were all consistently employed. As Table 1 indicated, the researcher encountered a uniformity of results that was reflected not

only in the stages that the study sites did not experience, but also in those that the study sites did experience. In addition to the consistency of study sites employing the same developmental stages, they all appeared to employ the same strategies within each developmental stage as well. Invariably, if one strategy was located within a particular stage at one study site, the same strategy also was discovered at the other two study sites. This similarity in the methods of establishing and continuing the programs existed despite significant differences among the respective institutional environments in general, and among the curriculum components of their respective honors programs in particular.

Although all of the study sites were considered to be comprehensive community colleges, all three were significantly different with regard to physical facilities, demographics of serving districts, location, and program emphasis. Similarly, the specific honors programs did have certain common elements, but there was considerable variety in the curriculum models offered at the three colleges. For example, one college emphasized a mentor system for its participants, among other components. Another college had initiated an interdisciplinary core curriculum, while the third college appeared to have emphasized its colloquia series.

The intent of this study, nevertheless, was not to describe the general environment of the three colleges studied, or to describe the curriculum components of their respective honors programs. The existence of these differences, however, does serve as a contrast to the similarities among the developmental stages in the establishment and continuation of their respective honors programs. The consistency in the results regarding the developmental stages employed, when contrasted with

the differences, appears to strengthen the assertion that Martorana and Kuhns' theory (excluding the trial stage) can be utilized when planning for the developmental stages that successful community college honors programs experience.

An academic planner contemplating the establishment of an honors program should take into consideration the unique characteristics of the environment within which the change is planned. Nevertheless, the results of this study strongly indicate that the strategies and tactics corresponding to at least four of the developmental stages theorized by Martorana and Kuhns should be an integral part of the planning of any community college honors program.

One conclusion reached by this researcher is that academic decision-makers considering the implementation of an honors program plan for an exploration, formulation, refinement, and institutionalization stage of development from the initiation of the planning process. Developmental activities should not be planned on a reactive basis, but should follow an overall, logical "blueprint" that considers all the stages in the process. From the beginning of the process, planners should assign tasks and delegate authority that will enable the program to progress through the four specified stages. None of these stages should be viewed in isolation, but should be viewed as a totality from the earliest possible time in the planning process.

CHAPTER IV
RECOMMENDATIONS: A MODEL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND
CONTINUATION OF HONORS PROGRAMS AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Since it has been determined that according to the confines of this study at least four of Martorana and Kuhns' developmental stages did apply to the establishment and continuation of honors programs at community colleges, the following model was structured around those four stages. This model, therefore, incorporates the researcher's recommendations concerning the most effective strategies and tactics relating to exploring, formulating, refining, and institutionalizing an honors program at a comprehensive community college. It is hoped that the final product of this planning will be a fully institutionalized honors program that meets the needs of the talented students it serves.

As previously suggested, academic decision-makers should be careful to plan for each of the developmental stages in advance, regardless of how the recommendations are adapted to suit unique institutional environments. Martorana and Kuhns (1975) wisely urged that innovators proceed "in a deliberate, step-by-step manner . . . progressing by well-scheduled partial changes through the several developmental stages to the ultimate institutionalization of the change" (p. 107). Additionally, they observed that most successful changes resulted from extensive institutional planning, and a clear understanding of the stages of the project. It is recommended that academic decision makers attend to these factors when observing the following strategies and tactics.

Exploration Stage

Three essential strategies should be initiated during this stage of development. First, the need for an honors program should be articulated throughout the college environment so that plans for such a program will be welcomed by more college constituencies than only the original change agents. Second, an honors ad hoc planning committee should be formed. Third, ad hoc committee members should begin the process of gathering pertinent information and discussing relevant issues so that the proposal that is later created will have substance and clarity. This activity would eventually lead to the formulation of a proposal for an honors program that constitutes a consensus of the committee members and is acceptable to other relevant groups throughout the college environment.

Numerous useful tactics can be employed in an effort to realize the first strategy mentioned: create a demand for an honors program. First, it is important that a top administrator takes an active interest in the establishment of the program. If interest in initiating an honors program does not already exist within the administrative ranks, involved faculty leaders should meet with an effective administrator with the intent of convincing him or her of the need for a program. Faculty members could summarize information contained in the "Introduction" and "Justification" sections of Chapter I of this study, or in the NCHC pamphlet Honors in the Two Year College (NCHC, 1983), in an attempt to gain administrative support. This support at the top levels of administration is essential in the early stages of planning.

Once administrative support is finally realized, the need for an honors program should be articulated to the college community at large. The need for an honors program should be emphasized in graduation

speeches, annual reports, strategic master plans, administrative bulletins, student newspapers, and other related documents. Faculty members and administrators should call informal meetings to share perceptions and to outline needs.

Information on the academically talented students currently enrolled at the community college or those enrolled at high schools in the serving district should be gathered from various recordkeeping and counseling personnel. If information exists concerning academically talented students who have dropped out of the community college, this should be gathered also. If this information can be linked to the need for an honors program, efforts should be initiated to demonstrate this connection. Also, academically talented students currently enrolled should be surveyed in order to document that student interest in an honors program exists.

All of these tactics can be initiated in order to ascertain that a demand for an honors program exists among a broad constituency at the campus. Once the demand for an honors program exists, a planning committee should be formed. Representation by many areas of the community college will help to ensure that the recommendations of the committee are generally accepted and acted upon. The optimal size of the committee appears to be approximately ten members.

If it appears that a representative group would be formed from volunteers, a memo should be distributed among the faculty explaining the goal of establishing an honors program and asking interested individuals to join the planning committee. If this does not ensure an even distribution of representation, an administrator should appoint faculty members from as many instructional and support areas as possible. If the

community college is multi-campus, a representative from each campus should certainly be a committee member. Recommendations from division chairpersons will frequently provide important input to the appointing process.

Once the committee is formed, the chairperson will need to gain approval for a relatively structured meeting schedule and agenda. The overall goal of the committee should be the creation of a written proposal that ultimately leads to the establishment of a fully institutionalized honors program.

One of the first assignments of the committee will be to form two sub-committees. One, a writing committee, should be drawn from the main group and charged with the responsibility of translating the ideas of the committee into a formal written proposal. Drafts of this proposal should be frequently shared with the entire committee throughout the planning process. The other sub-committee should also be drawn from the same group, and charged with the responsibility of reviewing related professional literature in the areas of collegiate honors programs in general, community college honors programs in particular, and also academic change at community colleges. This sub-committee should also initiate contact with other community colleges that already have established successful honors programs. Contacts with senior insitutions that in all probability will be accepting the graduates of the planned honors program should also be initiated.

Once these sub-groups have been formed, and once a regular meeting schedule has been decided upon with a deadline for the written proposal set, the agenda for the meetings will need to be determined. At least twelve crucial issues must be addressed by the committee before it will

be ready to create a significant proposal. Most aspects of the curriculum model that result from the planning will be determined by how the committee decides to address these twelve issues. It is recommended that the committee meet at least once every two weeks and devote a majority of its meeting time to addressing one or two of the following twelve issues.

The issues, many of which are discussed in the monograph, Honors in the Two Year College (NCHC, 1983), are listed below. A brief discussion of each issue is included.

1. **Rationale and Goal Statement:** The committee should have a clear idea concerning how an honors program can benefit students at the institution.
2. **Curriculum Components:** The committee must decide which honors curriculum components it wishes to employ, in what proportion, and for what reasons. The traditional honors curriculum components include honors sections of regular courses, honors colloquia, honors topics, honors concurrent registration, and honors thesis and/or independent study. Each model has its advantages and disadvantages, and the effectiveness of the model employed will largely depend upon the needs of students at individual community colleges.
3. **Selection and Evaluation of Faculty:** This is a vastly important issue. Most community colleges rely on an honors council composed of interested faculty members, division chairpersons, and various administrators, to select and evaluate honors faculty. It is recommended that individuals on the honors council, therefore, do not teach within the honors program itself.
4. **Faculty training needs:** The need to provide assistance in the area of faculty development should be stressed in the proposal. Specific tactics in this regard will be discussed later in this section.
5. **Faculty incentives:** Beyond the intrinsic rewards of teaching in the program, compensation for the extra responsibilities involved should be considered. This compensation could involve released time, stipends for program directors, and/or conference travel incentives.

6. Entrance criteria: Elements in addition to standardized test scores and GPA must be considered to ensure participation by "non traditional" learners. Entrance criteria should be designed so that the genuinely curious and motivated student is encouraged to participate.
7. Maintenance criteria: Some form of maintenance criteria is recommended. The specific format assumed will depend upon the number of honors students enrolled and the number of honors activities offered. Students could be requested, for example, to earn between three and five honors credits per semester, and to maintain an overall grade point average of 3.3. Graduation requirements for an honors associate of arts degree usually require 15 to 25 semester credits in honors courses with an additional honors activity (thesis, seminar, etc.) also required.
8. Appropriate recruitment activities: The proposal should stress the need for recruitment activities and make appropriate suggestions concerning them. Tactics aimed at recruiting talented students will be further discussed in the Institutionalization Stage of this section.
9. Target populations: Entrance criteria and target populations should be considered simultaneously. The process of considering entrance criteria and target populations is in essence an attempt to decide which of those in the entire student body might best be served through participation in an honors program.
10. Student incentives: Many options should be considered when establishing student incentives, including special recognition at commencement, pre-registering and orientation sessions, honors seals for diplomas, scholarships, and individualized transfer assistance. Student incentives will be further discussed in the institutionalization stage of this section.
11. Administrative network: The size of the administrative structure will, of course, depend upon the number of honors activities being offered. It is recommended, however, that the network include four components: (1) the chief academic officer of the college, (2) the honors council to advise and guide the program director, (3) the program director, and (4) the honors faculty.
12. Required resources: The proposal should include a recommendation that the honors program be given a budget of its own so as to avoid drawing upon other departmental funds. The costs of publicity, travel, recruitment, student incentives and any required special materials should be covered by this established budget. Since the benefits to the college are numerous in comparison to the costs involved, there should be no major objections to establishing a relatively small fund for the honors program.

Once the planning committee has considered these twelve issues and reached a degree of consensus concerning them, the written proposal can be completed. Once the proposal is completed, the focus of the planning process shifts from exploration activities to formulation activities.

Formulation Stage

The proposal written by the planning committee should be circulated, discussed, and, if necessary, modified during the formulation process. Pursuing this strategy will help to ensure that the entire college community feels a sense of ownership toward the program when it is implemented. This sense of ownership will, in turn, help to ensure that the program receives the type of ongoing support necessary to remain fully institutionalized.

Copies of the proposal should be sent to administrators and faculty leaders for their input. A discussion of the proposal should be placed upon the agenda of the faculty senate and administrative cabinet meetings. Members of the planning committee ought to be present at these meetings to answer questions and elaborate upon the plans for the program. The proposal also will need to be circulated to such departments as admissions, counseling, recordkeeping, and financial aid. The subsequent support of personnel in these areas will be essential to the effectiveness of the program. The proposal also could be discussed in division and department meetings.

Once the proposal is circulated among significant college groups, necessary modifications should be made. After this is accomplished, the proposal should be submitted for formal approval. This usually involves its approval by the academic affairs committee. Once approved, it is

essential to include a section on the honors program in the next edition of the college catalog, counseling manual, high school articulation manuals, and any other official college document that may serve to institutionalize the program.

As previously stated, it is uncommon for the establishment of community college honors programs to draw significant criticism and opposition. If, however, this criticism and opposition occurs, it can be confronted in several ways. If the planning committee has developed a clear rationale and goal statement, that statement should be articulated to those opposing the honors program. It also is helpful to determine the amount of energy and funds directed toward other special programs on campus, in advance of any criticism or opposition. This oftentimes will serve to help justify the relatively small expenditure required for an honors program.

One of the most crucial strategies to pursue in the exploration stage is addressing faculty development needs. Honors faculty typically assume unique roles and responsibilities beyond those usually expected of community colleges faculty. An understanding of those roles and responsibilities will enable decision makers to plan more effectively for faculty development needs.

Honors students often will seek out teachers outside of class for additional guidance and instruction. The honors instructor must welcome this additional responsibility and encourage an "open door" policy during and beyond office hours. Motivated students also are prone to challenge and question teachers and other students during class discussions. Instructors will need to be prepared to welcome such challenges. Above all, the honors instructor should be committed to the goals of the

program. He or she should not only be interested in professional advancement, but should have a genuine interest in the intellectual growth of students. He or she must also maintain a repertoire of teaching methods designed to stimulate this spirit of inquiry.

In addition to the specialized counseling function inherent in this role, honors faculty will need to develop their skills in other areas. For example, the program director will often request that honors faculty participate in recruitment activities. Such participation will involve, among other activities, trips to local high schools. Therefore, it will be necessary for honors faculty to maintain ongoing communications with high school students, teachers, counselors and administrators to ensure that the college attracts its share of talented students. Honors faculty will also involve themselves in continual curriculum development, for academic offerings must remain challenging. No conscientious honors faculty members would believe that once the course proposal is accepted, the curriculum planning stage of his or her involvement is over. Continual revision of classroom material and procedures should become common practice.

The program director also may require faculty members to participate in the student screening process. Other additional demands made upon faculty may take the form of interviewing prospective students, reviewing student applications, and assisting honors program graduates in finding employment or in transferring to a senior institution.

Having outlined some of the unique roles and responsibilities inherent in the honors faculty position, it is now possible to suggest three specific tactics that will assist faculty in developing the necessary skills. First, a series of workshops should be initiated to

address the issue of honors curriculum development. Special care should be given to recognizing that honors work should not be "more of the same," but rather truly enriching and challenging work. A consultant with experience in this area would provide the necessary expertise.

Second, a series of workshops will need to be offered that focus upon the special challenges offered by academically talented students. A recent front page article in the Chronicle of Higher Education described some of the unique emotional needs that academically talented students frequently possess (Fields, 1984). The article suggested that too often these emotional needs are largely ignored because it is erroneously assumed that talented students can rely solely on their own resources when solving emotional, academic, or career-related problems. This second series of workshops should be aimed at assisting faculty members in meeting these unique needs. If possible, a person with significant experience in teaching academically talented students, or a person with a background in the psychology of superior students, will need to be retained to lead these workshops. It should not be assumed that the workshop leaders need to be individuals who are external to the college itself. Frequently, personnel already on the college's staff have had enough related experience to prepare viable discussions. Most importantly, the faculty's attention must be focused on the unique aspects of participating in an honors program.

A third series of activities could be employed as a tactic for addressing faculty-development needs. These activities will need to stress, among other things, the realization that a well established honors program often takes several years to develop. Throughout this time, it is important that faculty communicate with one another. It

would be advisable, therefore, to designate a specific time for faculty to meet on a regular basis to discuss curriculum development and other related concerns. Those meetings would ideally occur on a regular basis throughout the existence of the program. If the program is to become truly innovative and responsive to students' needs, these informal gatherings of faculty are essential. Frequently, effective team teaching arrangements and interdisciplinary courses will evolve as a direct result of honors faculty meeting regularly.

Other elements of faculty training may be considered after the instructional staff has been determined. Once assembled, the honors faculty should be given opportunities to suggest developmental experiences that they deem most appropriate. Site visits to colleges with successful honors programs may be of value. Travel to national and regional NCHC conferences could also be useful.

After sufficient exploration and formulation activities have occurred, the program can begin to be offered to students. Because a trial stage was not found to be particularly useful for community college honors programs, it is recommended that no such "pilot project" be instituted. It should be stated in this regard, though, that new programs should be kept relatively small in scope at their inception, and should subsequently build upon what has become firmly established. A new program that attempts to accomplish too much too quickly may be unable to ensure quality of service. Such a program is almost certainly doomed to failure. New programs, moreover, that are viewed only as a collection of "piling it on" courses also are almost inevitably failures. Curriculum planners must insure, once the program has experienced the exploration and formulation stages of development, that the ultimate focus be placed

upon the quality of instruction and learning, not simply upon the quantity of student work. The maintenance of such a focus requires that continual emphasis be reiterated through faculty development sessions and administrative leadership.

Refinement Stage

The data collected for this study suggested that formal evaluation procedures were not stressed at the study sites. Initiating a highly formalized evaluation process is not, therefore, recommended. Devising a strategy for an informal and ongoing evaluation process is crucial, however, and appropriate tactics should be initiated during the Refinement Stage of the innovation process for this purpose.

The relatively small number of students involved in the honors program should enable the director to conduct follow-up studies of program graduates on a personalized basis. The director may wish to interview personally as many of the program's graduates as possible, either directly or by telephone. If this contact with graduates is not possible, questionnaires should be sent to program graduates concerning their experiences while in the program. The information garnered from these inquiries could be compiled and stored. Later in the Refinement Stage, this information should be used to document the successes of the program or to help decision-makers make necessary adjustments in the program's format.

In addition to follow-up studies, another tactic for evaluation is the expanded use of student evaluation forms. Frequently, program directors do not rely solely on the student evaluation form utilized throughout the college. Instead, they create an additional form which is

tailored to the honors program, and which meets the approval of the honors faculty. Since honors students generally are skilled in the area of written communication, a series of open-ended essay questions is suggested.

Another tactic utilized in the evaluation of honors programs is the encouragement of open and informal verbal discussions of the program. One program director suggested to this researcher that if communication is encouraged among faculty and students, one quickly hears about the strengths of the program, and just as quickly hears about the weaknesses. This informal communication may be the most important form of evaluation to utilize during the refinement of the honors program. Whatever tactics are decided upon, it is not recommended that a significant amount of time and funds be devoted to formalized evaluation based upon written documents and visiting consultants.

Identifying and recruiting students in an informal manner should begin as soon as the written proposal is approved. In the refinement stage, however, carefully planned tactics should be employed for this purpose. Later, in the institutionalization stage, recruitment activities should intensify. First, it is important to develop liasons with students, teachers, counselors, and administrators from the local high schools. An open house could be conducted on the community college campus to share information about the honors program with such persons. If possible, faculty members should individually contact high school personnel to discuss the program as well. Actually visiting high school classes and disseminating information about the program would also be of value. And finally, faculty at the community college should be asked to discuss the program in their classes.

For these and other recruitment activities, a brochure describing the program will need to be developed and distributed. Other related documents also should be circulated. Obviously, information regarding the honors program should appear in college publications such as the general catalog, college-high school articulation manual, course schedules, and other similar publications. Additional recruitment tactics will be discussed in the Institutionalization section of this study.

Since a formal evaluation procedure was not recommended, the creation and distribution of a formal self-study document is not recommended. It would be beneficial, however, to share the results of the informal evaluation process conducted throughout the refinement stage with various college and community groups. One college that this researcher studied monitored honors program graduates. This college then compiled a list of some of the more outstanding accomplishments of their graduates. This list was distributed in appropriate locations throughout the college and the college's serving district, including the local media outlets.

Although community colleges typically have a large number of advisory committees guiding their various programs, it does not seem necessary to create a community advisory committee for honors programs. The creation of such a committee would certainly do no harm to the program, but the possible benefits derived from such an undertaking would probably not be worth the required expenditure of time and energy. It is important, however, to maintain contact with local community leaders. Such leaders should be invited to participate in symposiums, seminars, or other events sponsored by the honors program. Local leaders also may be invited to address honors classes in their particular area of expertise.

All of these activities serve to enrich the learning experiences of honors students, while developing a healthy rapport with community leaders, who frequently contribute various forms of tangible support to the honors program. For example, one community college in Nevada developed a resource development plan which was built upon extensive community contacts (Behrendt, 1984). This resource development plan was later responsible for securing a significant amount of funds from private sources for use in the development of the honors program. Maintaining contact with the community, although not necessarily in the form of advisory committees, can consequently result in many tangible and intangible rewards. Therefore, continuing some form of appropriate communication with the community throughout the refinement and institutionalization stages is recommended.

Institutionalization Stage

One of the most important strategies employed throughout the institutionalization stage, and indeed throughout the entire establishment of an honors program, involves the selection of personnel for decision-making positions. As previously stated in this report, typically four major personnel components are involved in an honors program structure: chief academic officer, honors council, program director, and honors faculty. During the institutionalization stage of development, and preferably before that stage, the selection of the honors council and program director should be of primary concern. Since the chief academic officer is a relative constant, and the honors faculty have been discussed elsewhere in this report, it is appropriate here to

discuss some of the issues to be considered when selecting the program director and the honors council.

The person most crucial to the success of the program is the program director. This individual should be appointed by the chief academic officer of the college. The individual selected will bear a larger share of the responsibilities for the operation of the program than any other individual. This person should be a respected faculty member, or an administrator who works particularly well with faculty. If the director is an administrator, it is advisable that he or she have teaching experience. Such an individual should be capable of successfully fulfilling the following responsibilities:

1. be responsible for the overall operation of the program,
2. provide publicity and information services,
3. organize recruitment activities,
4. screen prospective students,
5. maintain records on student progress and certify student achievement,
6. select faculty for honors council approval,
7. evaluate honors course proposals,
8. evaluate teacher effectiveness,
9. organize special orientation and registration activities,
10. handle budgetary concerns,
11. provide a liaison between faculty and administration, and
12. oversee the awarding of scholarships through a coordinated effort with the financial aid director.

Of all the director's responsibilities, none will be more important than organizing recruitment activities. The principle thrust of these activities will be the cultivation and maintenance of professional

relationships with local secondary educators including faculty, counselors, and principals. The director must be willing to visit high schools and talk to groups of prospective students. One initial factor in the continued success of the program will be the director's ability to convince talented students from the local high schools, and from other appropriate locations, that the honors program offers them a quality learning experience.

Another key role will be, of course, the selection, evaluation, and possible dismissal of honors faculty. Since the director will be performing these tasks with the assistance of the honors council, it would be helpful if he or she were a person highly regarded by the faculty. As recommended in the NHCH monograph (1983), the director should not be involved in the teaching of honors sections, chiefly because of this evaluative role.

If the director is a faculty member, he or she would be given released time and/or an extra stipend. Since the position will require a great deal of record keeping, a student assistant should be assigned to the director.

The director should be provided with line item funds, budgeted at the discretion of the chief academic officer. These funds should be used to finance brochures, banquets, travel expenses, and other items agreed upon by the director and the chief academic officer.

The honors council, the second important administrative component, should meet regularly and provide guidance and direction for the program director. If the community college is a multi-campus operation, it is suggested that each campus be represented on the council. Frequently, campus provosts, division chairpersons, and various academic

administrators (or their designees) serve on the council along with faculty members. If the college has a dean for instructional advancement, he or she should also serve on the council. Additionally, the program director should be a council member. Typically, five to ten individuals constitute the honors council. Suggested responsibilities of the council include the following:

1. recommend policies and procedures,
2. approve course proposals,
3. approve faculty staffing recommended by the director,
4. assist with student transfers and scholarships,
5. assist with the requisition of needed funds for faculty development, publicity, or other program needs not provided for in the director's budget, and
6. in general, oversee the integrity of the program.

The program's organizational chart ought to resemble the following hierarchy:

1. chief academic officer
2. honors council, including:
 - a. campus provosts (or their designees)
 - b. division chairpersons (or their designees)
 - c. dean for instructional advancement (or a designee)
 - d. program director
 - e. faculty leaders
3. program director
4. honors faculty

An expanded administrative network may be required if the program experiences a significant amount of growth in future years. A community and/or student advisory board, for instance, may be added among other elements.

Once the administrative framework has been determined and individuals have been selected for positions, the program director should identify the primary administrator responsible for honors program funding. Frequently, this is the chief academic officer. The program director may then wish to send committee meeting minutes, announcements, newsletters, and other pertinent information to that administrator on a regular basis. This tactic helps to ensure that the individual responsible for allocating funds to the honors program is aware of activities made possible through such allocations.

In addition to promoting activities involving the selection of decision making personnel, efforts to promote the establishment of permanent office locations constitute an important strategy in the institutionalization stage. If possible, permanent locations should be secured for the director's office, the honors library, and the honors lounge. The establishment of visible locations on campus clearly identified with the honors program will lend the program an image of solidity and permanence. This solidity and permanence is essential if the honors program is to obtain "full acceptance . . . into the regular operations of the institution" (Martorana & Kuhné, 1975, p. 180).

It is common practice for the director to use his or her office as the honors program office. If this is done, clearly visible signs should be displayed identifying the location as the honors office. It is recommended that a student assistant be assigned to the director to work in the honors office. This assistant could function as an informal receptionist and could assist in performing the necessary clerical duties involved with the honors program.

If space is available, the tactic of establishing an honors lounge and library is suggested. This would also help to establish recognition of the program as a permanent entity within the college. The establishment of a library and lounge would also, and more importantly, help to develop a sense of community among honors faculty and students. When a sense of community exists among honors faculty and students, it usually results in more informal cooperative learning experiences and thus has a general enriching effect on the entire program . . . indeed, on the entire campus.

A word of caution, though, regarding the establishment of an honors lounge and library is appropriate at this time. These facilities should not be developed in such a way as to draw charges of elitism from other faculty and students. Faculty and students not presently participating in honors should never be excluded from an honors library or lounge. On the contrary, they should be encouraged to learn more about the program by virtue of congregating at these facilities.

Throughout the institutionalization stage of development, the strategy of increasing and refining recruitment activities becomes critical. Administrators and faculty should not assume that by simply offering enriched experiences for talented students, those experiences will be utilized by appropriate students. Efforts to ensure that talented and motivated students take advantage of the opportunities offered by the honors program should be continued throughout the existence of the program. Many tactics can serve this purpose. A few useful ones are suggested below.

Honors faculty should increase the number of visits they make to local high schools. Arrangements should be made for graduates of the

honors program or students currently enrolled in the program to accompany the faculty member to the high school. If interested high school students have the opportunity to ask questions of graduates or current participants, it is likely that greater interest in the program will be generated.

Additionally, lists of academically talented students should be obtained from high school counselors. These students could then be individually contacted through the mail and, if possible, by telephone or in person.

Other forms of contact with local high school students may prove to be effective. Arrangements might be made for academically talented students to visit the community college campus for various activities, particularly for extended periods during the summer. Also, special workshops or instruction could be offered for their benefit.

Another useful tactic is for the program director to request that honors program participants write a personal letter to prospective students encouraging them to participate in the honors program. Additional contact could be made in high schools by providing counselors with regularly updated information to be dispersed. An attractive, informative brochure should be developed and sent annually to local high schools. One of the most effective brochures reviewed by this researcher was created by the staff of Richlands College in Dallas, Texas. This brochure would serve as a useful example for any community college desiring to create its own (Richland College Honors, 1984).

To this point, most of the discussion of increased recruitment activities has centered upon contact with local high schools. It must be stressed, however, that frequently the most appropriate and successful

honors student can be classified as a "non-traditional" learner. These non-traditional students, who could be described as above the traditional student age, place-bound, a minority, or as women, often contribute a refreshing blend of curiosity and motivation to an honors program. Often, these students appear to pursue the intrinsic value of education. Consequently, they seem to experience significant growth through their participation in an honors program.

Contact with these non-traditional students, therefore, should be continually initiated. Other college faculty, as well as college counselors, should be encouraged to recommend non-traditional students who seem appropriate for honors work. The program director could plan to visit evening classes to discuss the honors program, as non-traditional learners most frequently attend those classes. Appropriate organizations within the college community should also be encouraged to distribute information regarding the honors programs. If the college has a women's study center, or a veteran's association, for example, such an organization could be urged to inform its membership of the program.

In addition to contacting promising traditional and non-traditional students, incentives should be built into the program to help attract motivated students. The chief incentive for students participating in an honors program would be the enhanced educational opportunities offered by such a program. Certainly, academic programs of recognized quality will attract and retain gifted students. The assurance of quality academic offerings, therefore, should always be the foremost goal. However, the college should provide students with additional incentives that go beyond the fundamental rewards inherent in participating in enriched educational experiences.

It is not surprising that honors students frequently mention financial incentives when asked what might attract them to an honors program. Achievement scholarships are frequently awarded to students participating in honors programs and should be advocated throughout the Institutionalization Stage of development. Scholarships take many forms, but generally range from \$100 per semester to well over \$1,000 per year. These awards should be made to students upon admission to the honors program. The award should continue until graduation, if the student remains in good standing. The established cash amount will need to be determined after an estimate is made regarding the amount of funds available and the number of students involved. The mechanics of the process may simply involve the program director sending a list of students in good standing to the financial aid director. Upon receipt of the list, the financial aid director could then authorize the release of a check to honors students. A more formalized process may be required if the number of students receiving aid becomes relatively large. Since the program will probably be small in the beginning, the early terms of operation may not require much more than has been outlined.

Other incentives should also be offered, possibly in the form of a special certificate being awarded during graduation exercises to the graduates of the honors program. These graduates should also be listed in a special section of the program printed for graduation ceremonies. In addition, a special honors banquet could be organized on an annual basis to recognize participating faculty and graduates. If the list does not become too lengthy, each graduate should receive a personalized letter by the director outlining specific achievements. This letter should be co-signed by the program director and the president of the

college. It is the intent of the letter to assist the graduate in transferring to a four-year institution or in gaining future employment.

To ensure that honors program students are distinguished from those students listed on the dean's list and scholastic honors list generated solely by GPA, a distinctive program name might be considered. Community colleges have used such names as "Capstone," "Horizons," and "Touchstones" to identify their honors program. Any appropriate title might be considered in order to give the program a distinctive identity.

Early registration and special orientation sessions could be arranged for honors students. These sessions would serve to ease the problems created by the relatively limited honors offerings. Honors students will no doubt need to create a more precise schedule in order to register for the limited honors offerings. These special orientation sessions could assist students in this regard.

Other incentives may be added as the program develops. The forms of transfer assistance offered by RCC and highlighted in Chapter II of this study, are highly recommended. Solicitation of university scholarships, free tickets to cultural events, and a faculty mentor system are only a few of the possibilities. Regardless of the form the incentives take, however, the premise upon which they are built should be clear: The most important incentive for participating in an honors program is the intrinsic value inherent to enriched educational opportunities; however, students who are willing to face the added challenge of an honors curriculum deserve additional recognition and reward.

A final recommendation in the area of increased recruitment activities concerns the local newspaper and other media outlets. It has been demonstrated that local newspapers and other media sources are

generally receptive to reports concerning honors program activities. Program directors are urged to contact these sources whenever activities appear to be newsworthy. Examples of how media sources have been useful in dispersing information regarding community college honors programs were discussed in Chapter II of this study. It is evident that with a minimal amount of effort, imaginative program directors can gain for their respective programs a significant amount of media exposure. This media exposure generally helps to develop healthy public relations, and helps to attract appropriate students to the program.

Figure 1 presented below is a chart summarizing the more significant activities described in this model. The activities are classified according to the developmental stages found to be valid for community college honors programs. The arrows indicate the "progression along (the) continuum from incipient exploration through total institutionalization" (Martorana and Kuhns, 1975, p. 180). The arrow drawn below the institutionalization stage signifies that many of these activities (especially those in the refinement and institutionalization stages) should reoccur throughout the existence of the program, so that the community college honors program remains within the regular operation of the respective institution.

Exploration Stage

Need for honors programs articulated

Ad hoc planning committee formed

Ad hoc committee members gather
information and discuss issues

Written proposal prepared

Formulation Stage

Proposal circulated, discussed, and,
if necessary, modified

Proposal submitted for formal approval

Faculty development needs addressed and
ongoing development activities initiated

Decision to offer program to
students made

Figure 1

Progression of Activities in the Establishment and
Continuation of Community College Honors Programs

Refinement Stage

Appropriate students identified and recruited

Strategy for an informal and ongoing evaluation
process and follow-up study devised

Results of informal evaluation process and
follow-up study distributed

Institutionalization Stage

Selection of personnel for decision-making
positions finalized

Permanent office locations established

Recruitment activities increased and refined

Figure 1--continued

CHAPTER V SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As indicated in Chapter I of this study, there has not been extensive formal research carried out in the area of collegiate honors programs. Community college programs, moreover, appear to have been the focus for an even smaller portion of research activities than other areas of collegiate honors programs. This may be in part a result of the fact that community college honors programs are a relatively fledgling phenomenon within higher education. Regardless of the reasons for this lack of research, however, it is clear that a body of knowledge specifically focused upon community college honors programs needs to be developed.

For the convenience of individuals wishing to study the specific programs further, a list of community colleges belonging to the League for Innovation in the Community College that have established honors programs is included in Appendix E. This list was drawn from a section entitled "Reports on Specific Colleges with Honors Programs" published in a recent report by McKeague, White and Wilders (1984).

This section will briefly outline some of the areas of community college honors programs of which additional research is needed. It should be stressed that a wide range of possible topics exists, and almost any study that reflects scholarly integrity would make a contribution. Suggestions for further research can arbitrarily be

divided into three broad categories: (1) student characteristics, (2) program results, and (3) program characteristics.

Much more information is needed on the student population participating in community college honors programs. Answers should be sought to the following questions: What are the general demographics of community college honors students? What are the educational and societal backgrounds of the majority of community college honors students? What unique demands do honors students make upon honors faculty? How might these unique demands best be met? What are the differences between students who are given the option to participate in a community college honors program and choose to do so, as opposed to those who are given the option and choose not to participate? How does gender, race, ethnic, and other inherent differences among honors students interact with different honors curriculum components and different teaching methodologies? Have student incentives proven to be related to program outcomes? Which incentives are most often utilized? Which are the most effective student motivators?

More information also needs to be gathered concerning the impact that community college honors programs make upon students. There needs to be a further clarification of what community college honors programs are attempting to accomplish and, further, what community college honors programs are in fact accomplishing. Answers to the following questions, therefore, should be pursued: How should desired outcomes be defined within the confines of a community college honors program? What should be considered a satisfactory result? What would a longevity study on the impact of community college honors program upon graduates reveal? Do

certain teaching methodologies have a greater impact upon community college honors students? And if so, what are those methodologies?

More information regarding community college honors program characteristics is also needed. The following questions should be explored in this regard: What curriculum components are currently employed? Which have proven to be most successful, and in what combination? How should the curriculum components of a community college honors program differ from what the college offers in its regular sections? What would a profile of community college honors program directors reveal? What unique characteristics should honors faculty possess? What are the most effective selection methods for honors faculty? How many components should be included in the administrative network of a community college honors program? If there is an honors council, what is the optimal number of members? And also, what would a taxonomy of the characteristics of community college honors programs across the nation reveal?

Inquiries into these and many other questions regarding community college honors programs would be worthwhile endeavors. The provision of information would help to guide academic decision makers at those institutions as they seek to meet the variety of educational needs of their talented students. Since little information presently exists, both statistical and qualitative information is needed. Both forms of inquiry, therefore, are encouraged.

One final thought on the need for further research should be included in this discussion. As stated in Chapter I, this study assumed that honors programs have an important role in community colleges, and that discovering and suggesting successful strategies and tactics for use in implementing these programs are worthwhile tasks. This study held that

it is evident that challenging students at an appropriate academic level, and specifically, that providing special learning opportunities for academically gifted community college students, is beneficial to those students in particular, and to society in general. Perhaps the most important future research in the area of community college honors programs would seek to determine the validity of the primary assumption made in this study: that honors programs have an important role in the curriculum of community colleges.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. (1975). Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, C. G. (1970). Open admissions for honors programs. Journal of Higher Education, 41, 319-322.
- Aydelotte, F. (1944). Breaking the academic lock step: The development of honors work in American colleges and universities. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bay, L. (1978). Honors programs revisited. Community and Junior College Journal, 49(3), 18-21.
- Behrendt, R. L. (1984). Honors programs and private funding: How one community college succeeded. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Bennett, M. (1978, October 31). Honors program: Enriching and gratifying experience. The Bagpiper, p. 1.
- Bennett, M. (1979, May 21). Honors program continues growth. The Bagpiper, p. 1.
- Carter, J. (1978, December 9). Visions of utopia: Down with cars, motels: Up with nature. Daytona Beach News Journal, p. 1, 2.
- Cohen, J. W. (Ed.) (1966c). The superior student in American higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cuttillo, J. (1977a, October, 12). Honors program more than an intellectual exercise. The Bagpiper, p. 1, 3.
- Daniel, W. W. (1978). Honors and the democratic ideal. Forum for Honors, 9(2), 17-18, 20.
- Fields, C. M. (1984). Problems of the gifted get too little notice, psychologists say. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 29(2), 1,8.
- Finn, C. E. (1981). Toward a new consensus. Change, 13(6), 16-21, 60-63.

- Friedlander, J. (1983). Honors programs in community colleges. Community and Junior College Journal, 53(5), 26-28.
- Gardner, J. W. (1961). Excellence: Can we be equal and excellent too? New York: Harper and Row.
- Gardner, J. W. (1984). Excellence: Can we be equal and excellent too: Revised edition. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Honors programs provide added learning. (1976, November 3). The Bagpiper, p. 1.
- Levine, A. (1980). Why innovation fails. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Martorana, S. V., & Kuhns, E. (1975). Managing academic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McKeague, P. M., White, C. M., & Wilders, M. K. (1984). Survey of honors programs: A resource inventory and directory. Laguna Hills, California: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Nancy Kass and the M./T.S. honors program at RCC. (1983, March 7). Outlook, p. 5.
- National Collegiate Honors Council (no date). Handbook for the evaluation of an honors program. College Park, MD: National College Honors Council.
- National Collegiate Honors Council. (1983). Honors in the two-year college. College Park, MD: National College Honors Council.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. (Stock No. 065-000-00177-2). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Olivas, M. A. (1975). A statistical portrait of honors programs in two-year colleges. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 136 890).
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Phillips, M. J. (1973). Honors programs in higher education today: An overview. Forum for Honors. 3(3), 13-15, 18.
- Piland, W. E., & Azbell, J. (1984). The honors program student: A typical profile. Community and Junior College Journal. 54(7), 45-48.

- Piland, W. E., & Gould, K. (1982). Community colleges and the honors programs: Are they mutually exclusive? The College Board Review, 123, 25-27, 37.
- Rother, C. (1978). Starting an honors program. Forum for Honors, 8(4), 4-8.
- Smith, T. L. (1981). Ideas that ramify: Honors at an open admissions commuter institution. Forum for Honors, 12(1), 7-12, 35-36.
- Straus, R. (1976). The argument about meritocratic undergraduate education. Forum for Honors, 7(1), 36-40.
- Weir, W. D. (1976). Equality and excellence in a democratic society. Forum for Honors, 7(2), 14-17.
- Winters, P. (1982, August 29). RCC honors program works wonders. The Journal News, p. 8.

APPENDIX A
CHECKLIST USED AS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Person Interviewed _____
 Title _____
 Location _____
 Date _____
 Other _____

Exploration Stage

A. Strategy: Create a demand for honors programs.

- A1. Tactic: Top administrator or respected faculty member takes the initiative to become a change agent.
- A2. Tactic: Need for honors program emphasized in graduation speeches, annual reports, administrative bulletins, or related documents.
- A3. Tactic: Call informal meetings to share perceptions and outline needs.
- A4. Tactic: Survey academically talented students in an effort to determine their needs.
- A5. Tactic: Gather information on academically talented students from record keeping and counseling personnel.
- A6. Tactic: Provide a detailed written analysis of the need for an honors program. This needs assessment should include information drawn from as many different sources as possible.
- A7. Tactic: Distribute the needs assessment to administrators, selected faculty, and standing academic committees.

B. Strategy: Form honors planning committee .

- B1. Tactic: Distribute memo to faculty explaining the goal of establishing an honors program and asking interested individuals to meet to discuss this topic.

- B2. Tactic: Informally meet with faculty leaders individually and urge them to become involved in the establishment of an honors program. Explain the need and the rationale.
- B3. Tactic: Conduct planned, informal gatherings to explain the need for an honors program and urge individuals to attend the planning committee meetings.
- C. Strategy: Create a formal proposal for an honors program.
 - C1. Tactic: Honors program planning committee develops an agenda and meets regularly.
 - C2. Tactic: Planning committee selects a writing committee, or one individual drawn from the group, to be responsible for translating the ideas of the committee into a formal written proposal.
 - C3. Tactic: One or more individuals reviews the related professional literature and reports this to the committee.
 - C4. Tactic: Planning committee attempts to reach consensus upon crucial issues, including the following:
 - 1. rationale and goal statement,
 - 2. curriculum components,
 - 3. selection and evaluation of faculty,
 - 4. faculty training needs,
 - 5. faculty incentives,
 - 6. entrance criteria,
 - 7. maintenance criteria,
 - 8. appropriate recruitment activities,
 - 9. target populations,
 - 10. student incentives,
 - 11. administrative network, and
 - 12. required resources.

- C5. Tactic: Planning committee includes as many different sectors of community college personnel as possible in the planning process.

Formulation Stage

- A. Strategy: Formal proposal circulated, discussed, modified.
- A1. Tactic: Copies of proposal sent to administrators and selected faculty for input.
- A2. Tactic: Proposal circulated to such critical area personnel as admissions, counseling, record keeping, financial aid.
- A3. Tactic: Proposal discussed in division and department meetings with representative of planning committee present.
- A4. Tactic: Proposal discussed at academic planning committee meeting.
- A5. Tactic: Rewrite original proposal following discussion and debate. Submit to proper channels for approval.
- B. Strategy: Determine obstacles and confront opposition.
- B1. Tactic: Anticipate the philosophical arguments against honors programs. Be prepared to articulate counterarguments by relating a clear statement of rationale and goals.
- B2. Tactic: Determine the amount of energy and funds directed toward other special programs. This information may be used to help justify the relatively small expenditure usually required for honors programs.
- C. Strategy: Address faculty development needs.
- C1. Tactic: After decisions are made concerning the selection of faculty and the identification of their essential roles and functions, formulate ongoing plans to train faculty.
- C2. Tactic: Locate a consultant to provide faculty with training sessions addressing the following two topics: (1) developing an honors curriculum, (2) dealing with the special challenges offered by academically talented students.

- C3. Tactic: Schedule time for faculty to meet on a regular basis to discuss curriculum development and other related concerns.

Trial Stage

- A. Strategy: Begin trial project.
- A1. Tactic: Offer a limited number of honors sections involving a limited number of students.
- A2. Tactic: Initiate a limited number of extra curricular activities for honors students.
- A3. Tactic: Set a definite time limit for the implementation of the trial project.
- B. Strategy: Initiate a careful evaluation and readjustment procedure.
- B1. Tactic: Initiate student evaluation.
- B2. Tactic: Initiate evaluation by faculty and administrators participating in the program.
- B3. Tactic: Form committee of administrators, faculty, and students who are uninvolved in the program and ask them to evaluate it.
- B4. Tactic: Retain an outside consultant to evaluate the success of the program.
- C. Strategy: Identify and recruit students.
- C1. Tactic: After appropriate entrance criteria have been established, determine target populations and contact those populations.
- C2. Tactic: Initiate and develop liasons with students, teachers, and administrators at local high schools.
- C3. Tactic: Ask community college faculty to discuss the program in their classes.
- C4. Tactic: Develop brochure and other informative documents, and circulate them in an appropriate manner. .
- C5. Tactic: Include honors program section in the college catalogue and in college-high school articulation manual.

Refinement Stage

- A. Strategy: Distribute results of self-study and evaluation by external agents.
 - A1. Tactic: Make presentation at division meetings and other committee meetings relating the results of the evaluation, and seek reactions.
 - A2. Tactic: Write a report based upon the results of the evaluation and distribute it. Again, seek reactions.
 - A3. Tactic: Make necessary adjustments based upon recommendations found in evaluation and reaction materials.
- B. Strategy: Initiate follow-up studies of graduates of the trial program.
 - B1. Tactic: Send out questionnaires to graduates concerning their experiences while in the program.
 - B2. Tactic: Personally interview as many graduates as possible to gather similar data.
- C. Strategy: Set up advisory committee of students and community representatives.
 - C1. Tactic: Locate student leaders who will participate as committee members.
 - C2. Tactic: Locate community leaders who will participate as committee members.

Institutionalization Stage

- A. Strategy: Select personnel for decision-making positions and establish permanent office locations.
 - A1. Tactic: Determine administrative framework.
 - A2. Tactic: Select one individual to oversee the total project.
 - A3. Tactic: Identify the primary administrator responsible for honors funding support. Send committee meeting minutes, announcements, newsletters, and other pertinent information to that office on a regular basis.
- B. Strategy: Permanent office locations.

- B1. Tactic: Designate an office for the honors director, with clerical assistance available.
- B2. Tactic: Establish an honors library.
- B3. Tactic: Establish an honors lounge.
- C. Strategy: Increase recruitment activity.
 - C1. Tactic: Arrange for graduates of trial program to visit local high schools.
 - C2. Tactic: Obtain lists of academically talented students from high school counselors; contact these students.
 - C3. Tactic: Arrange for academically talented students to visit the community college campus for various activities, particularly for extended periods during the summer.
 - C4. Tactic: Request that honors program participants write a personal letter to prospective students encouraging them to participate in the honors program.
 - C5. Tactic: Refine and improve the incentives offered to students, including scholarships, special recognition, and transfer assistance.
 - C6. Tactic: Provide guidance counselors (both on-campus and at the local high schools) with additional and regularly updated information that can be readily dispersed.
 - C7. Tactic: Seek favorable publicity in the local newspaper and other media outlets.

APPENDIX B
MAJOR FEATURES OF A FULL HONORS PROGRAM

1. Identify and select students of higher quality as early as possible. This involves far closer cooperation than has hitherto been the case with high schools and preparatory schools. The proper uses of predictive techniques, past records, entrance tests and interviews, and studies of aptitude, motivation and achievement are now being explored and much experience is being canvassed.
2. Start programs for these students immediately upon admission to the college or university and admit other superior students into these programs whenever they are later identified by their teachers.
3. Make such programs continuous and cumulative through all four years with Honors counseling especially organized and equally continuous.
4. Formulate such programs so that they will relate effectively both to all the college work for the degree and to the area of concentration, departmental specialization, pre-professional or professional training.
5. Make the programs varied and flexible by establishing special courses, ability sections, Honors seminars, colloquia and independent study. Advanced placement and acceleration will serve in a contributory role.
6. Make the honors program increasingly visible throughout the institution so that it will provide standards and models of excellence for all students and faculty, and contribute to the substitution of an "Honors outlook" for the "grade outlook."
7. Employ methods and materials appropriate to superior students. Experience has shown that this involves:
 - a. Bringing the abler students together in small groups in classes of from 5 to 20 students.
 - b. Using primary sources and original documents rather than textbooks where possible.

- c. Less lecturing and predigesting by the faculty of content to be covered; approaching selectively the subject matter to be covered; discouraging passive note taking; encouraging student adventure with ideas in open discussion - the colloquium method with appropriate modification of this method in science and professional schools.
 - d. Supplementing the above with increased independent study, research and summer projects.
 - e. Continuous counseling, in the light of the individual student's development, by teaching personnel, not by full-time non-teaching counselors.
 - f. Giving terminal examinations to test the Honors results.
8. Select faculty qualified to give the best intellectual leadership to able students and fully identified with the aims of the program.
 9. Set aside, where possible, such requirements as are restrictive of a good student's progress, thus increasing his freedom among the alternative facets of the Honors and regular curriculum.
 10. Build in devices of evaluation to test both the means used and the ends sought by an Honors program.
 11. Establish a committee of Honors students to serve as liaison with the Honors Committee or Council. Keep them fully informed on the program and elicit their cooperation in evaluation and development.
 12. Use good students wherever feasible as apprentices in teaching and as research assistants to the best men on the faculty.
 13. Employ Honors students for counseling, orientation and other academic advisory purposes in the general student body.
 14. Establish, where possible, an Honors center with Honors Library, lounge, reading rooms and other appropriate decor.
 15. Assure that such programs will be permanent features of the curriculum and not dependent on temporary or spasmodic dedication of particular faculty men or administrators - in other words, institutionalize such programs, budget them and build thereby a tradition of excellence.

APPENDIX C
INFORMAL SURVEY SENT TO ACADEMIC OFFICERS

Honors Program Survey

Please return to:
Jim Heck
Institute of Higher Education
229 Norman Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, 32601

As part of a research effort being conducted by the Institute of Higher Education, we would like to request an appropriate academic administrator at your college to fill out the following survey. This survey will help us to: (1) determine the current status of college wide honors programs in community colleges, (2) summarize suggestions regarding the planning and implementing of new or expanded honors programs at community colleges. Your kind consideration in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

1. Does your college have a college wide honors program?
☐ Yes ☐ No
2. If you answered "Yes" to Number 1, would you please briefly describe the curriculum model that you employ by answering the following questions:
 - a. What are the admission criteria?
 - b. In the Fall of 1983, approximately how many students were involved in the program?
☐ (no.) ☐ (% of total enrollment)
 - c. What is the stated rationale and/or objective of this program?
 - d. Please list academic areas which are included.
 - e. What are the main components of the model (separate honors classes, mentor system, extra work assigned to honors students enrolled in regular classes, etc.)?

- f. Do you offer any special incentive to faculty (released time, extra stipend, etc.)?
 - g. What incentives are offered to attract honors students (financial aid, special diploma, etc.)?
 - h. How do you evaluate the success of your honors program?
 - i. Please include with this survey any information (brochures, course descriptions) that would aid in our understanding of your honors program.
3. If you answered "No" to Number 2, do you have elements of an honors program at your college? Please describe (Lyceum series, honors English only, etc.).

NOTE: The following questions offer you the opportunity to state what you feel an honors program should include.

- 4. Do you think honors programs should be included in a community college curriculum? Why or why not?
- 5. What do you think the admission criteria should be?
- 6. What incentives for students do you think would be most important for a successful honors program?
- 7. What do you see as the chief benefits of having an honors program at a community college?
- 8. Do you have any suggestions regarding the implementation of a new honors program?
- 9. Person filling out this survey: _____
 Title _____
 Address _____

Thank you very much for your cooperation in this study. Please write below any further comments that you might have.

APPENDIX D
LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED AT STUDY SITES

Daytona Beach Community College

Dr. Catherine P. Cornelius.....Vice President, Academic Affairs
Mr. Phil A. Drummel.....Faculty, Social Science
Ms. Carolyn S. Lightsey.....Faculty, English (Former Chair of
Honors Council)
Mr. Robert J. Sharp.....Faculty, English (Honors Program
Director)
Mr. Richard Zelley.....Faculty, Humanities

DeKalb Community College

Dr. Richard B. Clow.....Faculty, History (Honors Program
Coordinator, South Campus)
Dr. Judith A. Michna.....Faculty, English (Honors Program
Coordinator, North Campus)
Dr. Martha T. Nesbitt.....Vice President, Academic Affairs
Dr. Ronald L. Swofford.....Provost, North Campus
Ms. Susan M. Thomas.....Faculty, English (Honors Program
Coordinator, Central Campus)

Rockland Community College

Ms. Jane Cohen.....Counselor, Student Services
Coordinator, Transfer Planning
Dr. Samuel Draper.....Faculty, English (Co-Director,
M./T.S. Honors Program)
Dr. Seymour Eskow.....Former President of the College
Dr. Thomas Fitzpatrick.....Faculty, Social Science/Psychology
Ms. Theresa Merkel.....Counselor, Student Services
(Coordinator of Career
Development)
Dr. Joseph M. Pirone.....Faculty, Social Science/
Psychology
Mr. James M. Thelen.....Faculty, Mathematics
Dr. Shirley K. Wethamer.....Faculty, Social Science/
Psychology

APPENDIX E
 SPECIFIC COLLEGES BELONGING TO
 THE LEAGUE FOR INNOVATION IN
 THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 LISTED AS HAVING HONORS PROGRAMS

Dallas County Community College District, Texas

Brookhaven College

Eastfield College

Richland College

Foothill-DeAnza Community College District, California

Foothill College

Kern Community College District, California

Bakerfield College

Porterville College

Los Angeles Community College District, California

West Los Angeles College

Maricopa County Community College District, Arizona

Glendale Community College

Maricopa Technical Community College

Mesa Community College

Phoenix College

Rio Salado Community College

Scottsdale Community College

South Mountain Community College

Miami-Dade Community College, Florida

New World Center Campus

North Campus

South Campus

Moraine Valley Community College, Illinois

Santa Fe Community College, Florida